

**FY 2012 Formula Grant Application  
2012-2014 Three Year Plan**

**Program Narrative**

**Analysis of Juvenile Crime Problems and Juvenile Justice Needs**

**(1) Analysis of Juvenile Crime Problems**

**Executive Summary**

As a participant of the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) Formula Grant Program, the Office of Youth Services is required to conduct an analysis of current juvenile crime problems, Juvenile justice and delinquency prevention and educational needs within the state. The Myron B. Thompson School of Social Work assesses delinquency trends by county, ethnicity, age, gender, and offense type at various stages of the state of Hawaii's juvenile justice system. The analysis covers the years 2009, 2010, and 2011 (Note: 2011 data is from January 1, 2011 to September 30, 2011 only). Major trends arranged by decision points in the system are summarized briefly below.

**Arrest**

Status offenses have consistently remained the highest offense type in arrests for all 3 years for all 4 counties. Status offenses for all three years for the State as well as the individual circuits made up for more than 40 to over 50% of all arrests. While Honolulu, Hawaii, and Kauai circuits showed property offenses was second highest for Maui in arrests. Maui circuit showed to have the largest percentage of arrests for drug and "other" offenses compared to other counties in 2009 and 2010.

**Referral**

The referral rates of Maui, Hawaii, and Kauai circuits were over twice that of the referral rates for Honolulu across the three years. All four circuits showed that the largest percentage of their referrals were from status offenses with Honolulu showing the highest percentage. It accounted for 40% or more of the referrals for each year, for each circuit. Several types of offenses are worth noting as they exceed that of Honolulu's referral percentages. Such offenses include drug and person no contact (NC) for Maui in 2009; drug offenses for Hawaii circuit in 2010 and 2011; and Kauai for person NC offenses in 2011.

**Diversion**

Overall, all four circuits showed that the largest percentage of their diversions were status offenses. Honolulu and Kauai circuits consistently had the largest percentage of diversions, generally exceeding state. The second largest offense in diversion was property offenses as shown in the rates for each circuit, and for the state.

**Petition**

In all the circuits, property and "other" types of offenses were among the top four in petition. Included in Hawaii and Maui circuits top four were drug and status offenses. Honolulu also

indicated status and personal offenses to be in its top four offenses that were petitioned while Kauai showing personal and drug offenses.

While the difference between male and female representation in each previous phase continues to show males to have a greater percentage than females, Honolulu showed the least difference between the two. However, in petition phase Honolulu circuit showed a large jump in the difference between male and female representation. All circuits reflected a percentage difference between the genders of nearly 30% or more across the three years.

### **Detention**

Detention rates were highest in 2009 and showed a marked decrease of the three years. The age groups that were the highest across the three years were either 16 or 17 in detention with males accounting for the larger percentage of the population in detention.

### **Adjudication**

Status and property offenses have consistently remained the top two highest offense types in adjudication for all 3 years according to the statewide data. A similar pattern is shown with Maui circuit. For Maui and Hawaii circuits, the top four types of offenses in adjudication for all three years are: status, property, other, and drug offenses. Honolulu is similar but instead of drug offenses it has person offenses as one of its top four. Kauai fluctuates a little more but throughout the three years property, other, and person offenses consistently are in the top four in adjudication.

### **Probation**

The probation rates declined over the three-year period. Hawaii circuit showed the highest probation rates while Honolulu showed the lowest for all three years. Following the statewide trend for all three years, Honolulu, Maui, and Hawaii circuits showed status offenses as the highest, and property offenses as second largest in probation. Property and other types of offenses were consistently the top two for Kauai. Given all arrests statewide, Hawaii circuit consistently had the highest percentage of probation cases for drug offenses across the years compared to other circuits.

### **Hawaii Youth Correctional Facility (HYCF/Secure Confinement)**

The rate of HYCF mandates for the State of Hawaii was 1.2 per 1000 youth in 2009. This rate declined to less than one over the next two years. Across, the three years, "other" types of offenses made up almost half or more in HYCF, followed by property, and then person offenses.

### **Waivers and Transfers**

No waiver and transfer cases of youth ages 10 – 17 were reported for the period.

### **Gender Race and Ethnicity**

At all points in the system males had the largest percentage in all phases. While gender differences were noticed in all phases of the system, the earlier stages (arrest, referral, and diversion) showed smaller gender differences. The latter stages (petition, detention, adjudication, HYCF) showed substantially larger differences between males and females. Older

age groups, generally age 16 and 17, also have the highest rates in the system for juveniles, beginning with arrests and establishing a trend that is consistent along decision points. Ethnically, Native Hawaiians, African-Americans, Mixed Pacific Islanders, and Samoans are generally overrepresented in the system at each decision point, again beginning with arrests. Filipinos are overrepresented in all phases except for detention and HYCF.

### **Introduction**

The State of Hawaii is required to conduct an analysis of current juvenile crime problems, juvenile justice and delinquency prevention and educational needs within the state. This includes a review of juvenile gangs, delinquency prevention and juvenile justice needs, and mental health services for juvenile within the state. The analysis would be the basis for the State's three-year plan that serves as the focal point for the formulation of the state's juvenile justice needs and problem statements. The Office of Youth Services being the Designated State Agency in Hawaii that administers this program and monitors compliance with the federal requirements of the JJDP Act contracted the University of Hawaii research team to perform the crime analysis that presents delinquency trends by county, ethnicity, age, gender, and offense type at various stages of the juvenile justice system.

### **Methodology**

Existing data from the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) was used for the crime analysis. The JJIS is the statewide information system managed by the State of Hawaii, Department of the Attorney General that combines juvenile offender information from the police, prosecutors, family court, and the Hawaii Youth Correctional Facility (HYCF). The system includes juveniles' first exposure to the justice system and extends through prosecution, adjudication, and incarceration. JJIS is also the repository for statewide information on missing children. Data for calendar year 2009, 2010 and up to **September 6<sup>th</sup> for 2011** were received through portable CD-ROMs. The entire data utilized in this analysis were in 3 files: Two access database files and an excel file. The two access databases are: (1) OJJDP Demo and Arrest, which contained information on juvenile's demographical data, such as date of birth, gender and ethnicity. Each individual was assigned a unique identification number (ID), which was then used to link with other data decision points. Information regarding all arrests during those time periods was also included in this database. (2) Court and HYCF, which contains information on all the other eight decision points (e.g., referral, petition, adjudication, probation, HYCF, etc) except arrest. For each of the 8 data decision points, the unique ID was used to link back with the demographic information. The Excel file contained information regarding charges, charge description, and major seven groups of offenses. To determine the major seven groups of offenses at each decision point, the corresponding data table (e.g., arrest, referral, etc) was connected with the Charge table, linked by the charge number.

At the point when each data decision point was identified and relevant demographic information was obtained, the data was then transferred to SPSS for further analysis, for each data decision point, except for detention, HYCF, and waiver, the following variables were included:

- Confidential JJIS identification number (this is a unique number provided to every youth who enters Hawaii's juvenile justice system)
- Sex (male, female, unknown\_

- County (both location of offense and youth's residence)
- Date of birth
- Date of arrest, referral, diversion, detention, etc.
- Offense(s) for which youth entered the juvenile justice system
- Offense severity (whether the offense was considered a Felon A, Felony B, Felony C, Misdemeanor, Petty Misdemeanor, Status Offense, or Law Violation offense)
- Ethnicity(ies)
- Age, decided by years between date of birth and the date that decision point occurred. For example, age when the juvenile was arrested was determined by the difference in years between arresting date and the juvenile's date of birth. Ages 10 – 17 were included for further analyses. Ages below 10 and 18 and older were eliminated from the analysis.
- Calendar year for each of those decision points.

For detention, information on the types of offenses and circuit were missing. The HYCF data also was missing information on the circuit only.

A total of 9 SPSS files were created based on the nine decision points or stages of the juvenile justice process (arrest, referrals to Family Court, Diversion, detention, petitions, adjudication, probation, HYCF, waiver to adult court). Those 9 files were then used for further analysis as described below.

### **Ethnicity**

The ethnicity variable was created by separating 29 different categories of various ethnicities into the 14 categories proposed and approved by the Juvenile Justice State Advisory Council's (JJSAC) Ethnic and Cultural Diversity Sub-Committee (aka DMC Committee) and the Judiciary's JDAI DMC Committee: Caucasian, Hawaiian, African-American, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Latino/Hispanic, Native American, Other Asian/Mixed Asian, Other Pacific Islander/Mixed Pacific Islander, Samoan, Other, and Unknown. A number was assigned to each of the 29 different ethnicities, and then broken down into the 14 categories. For example, Other Asian, Laotian, Thai, Vietnamese, East Indian, and Indonesian were assigned to the Other Asian/Mixed Asian category. The other Pacific Islander/Mixed Pacific Islander category includes Micronesian, Other Pacific Islander, Guamanian, Maori, and Tongan ethnicities. The Latino/Hispanic category included Hispanic, Spanish, Puerto Rican, Mexican and Other Hispanic/Latino. The Caucasian category included Caucasian and Portuguese. Native American and Alaskan Native were assigned to the Native American category. The remaining nine ethnicity categories were assigned their original label. Hawaiian, African American, Chinese, Filipino, Korean, Samoan, Other, and Unknown were all their own categories.

### **Analysis**

As a requirement of the juvenile crime analysis, the secondary data from JJIS was used to analyze the following:

1. Juvenile arrests by offense type, gender, age and race;
2. Number and characteristics (by offense type, gender, race, age) of juveniles referred to juvenile court, for allegedly committing a delinquent or status offense;
3. Number of cases handled informally (non-petitioned) or diverted

4. Number of cases handled formally (petitioned) by gender, race, and type of disposition (probation, commitment);
5. Number of delinquent and status offenders admitted, by gender and race, to juvenile detention facilities and waiver to adult court.

Because the JJIS data did not include gang related information, to fulfill this requirement of the grant, a literature review was done to provide information on gangs in Hawaii based on existing studies and articles.

#### **Analysis of each stage of the juvenile justice process**

The analysis does not assume that the stages to analyzed are in a sequence. All stages are analyzed separately and one has no bearing on another. As found in the analysis, youth identification codes for a stage may or may not be found in the previous stage. For example, a substantial amount of cases in referrals could not be located in the arrest data file of the same or previous year. This may be due to cases such as status offenses that were referred directly from the schools and were not recorded in the arrest decision point. Another reason for the uniqueness of each stage is due to the fact that circuits vary in the way they handle youth entering the juvenile justice system. For instance, Hawaii County on occasions may have a youth referred directly for family court without processing an arrest report particularly in cases where the police find adequate evidence that warrants family court involvement. Other reasons may be due to multiple entries to a stage. For example, detention cases may be from point of arrest, disposition, or from other stages of the juvenile justice system. Thus, the analysis will show a snapshot of a stage by age, gender, ethnicity, and type of offense.

#### **Duplicated and Unduplicated Counts – Determining Offense Severity**

In a given year, about half of all youth arrested are arrested for more than one offense. This proportion tends to hold up across the various stages in Hawaii's juvenile justice system. Given this pattern of youth being processed for multiple offenses, it was necessary that a system be established which would enable us to examine the unique number of youth that go through the system, as well as the total number of arrests, referrals, diversions, etc. that occur in each fiscal year. For example, if a youth was adjudicated five times in a fiscal year, he or she could be counted five times in analyses. When analyzed in this manner, the sheer number of adjudications rises substantially because those youth adjudicated more than once are counted more than once. In this report, these types of analyses will be referred to as "duplicated" counts. "Unduplicated" counts are when a youth is counted only once upon entry into the system regardless of the number of offenses.

At the request of the JJSAC working with the Office of Youth Services, some analyses in this report will present the data using duplicated counts, while others will examine unduplicated counts. When comparing different major offense categories, duplicated counts will be presented. When comparing the data by way of ethnicity, age, and gender, unduplicated counts will be presented. With regard to the latter three analyses (ethnicity, age, and gender), the council members wanted unduplicated counts in order to see the unique number of youth within those demographics who were being processed through the nine different juvenile justice system stages. However, committee members wanted to see the total impact of different offense types

that were occurring across Hawaii’s four counties, and therefore, asked to see duplicated counts for the seven different offense types. The only decision point that uses all duplicated counts is detention.

**Offense Categories**

Each of the forty-five offenses was categorized into seven major offense categories, presented in the following. The Juvenile Justice Information Committee’s subcommittee on research developed the offense categories established for this report. On the whole, these categories follow typical offense categories established in national studies although there are some exceptions. The “person no contact” category includes offenses typically included under the “person” category. However for the purposes of this report, the offenses of terroristic threatening, weapons violations, and harassment were combined to form the “person no contact” category since these offense, while severe, normally do not involve injurious physical contact.

Additionally, minor alcohol offenses are sometimes defined as status offenses. For the purposes of this report, any offenses involving alcohol (e.g., prohibitions) have been included in the “drug offense” category. Aside from these minor discrepancies, the seven major offense categories utilized in this report are similar to offense categories used in other juvenile delinquency research projects.

Person Offenses:

Homicide	Robbery
Assault 1 or 2	Abuse family member
Kidnapping	Assault 3

Sex Offenses

Sex Assault 1 or 2	Prostitution
Sex Assault 3	Open Lewdness
Sex Assault 4	

Drug Offenses:

Dangerous	Detrimental drugs (felonies)	Other drug violations
Detrimental drugs (felonies)	Detrimental drugs (misdemeanors)	
Harmful drugs	Alcohol (includes Prohibitions)	

Person No Contact Offenses:

Terroristic threatening 1	Harassment
Weapons (felonies)	Weapons (misdemeanors)
Terroristic threatening 2	

Property Offenses:

Burglary	Computer/credit card fraud	Other property
Motor vehicle theft	Larceny-theft 3 or 4	Trespass (violations)
Larceny-theft 1 or 2	Trespass (misdemeanor)	

Status Offenses:

Protective supervision Violation	Beyond parental control	Person in need of supervision
Runaway	Curfew	Compulsory school Attendance
Truancy	Injurious behavior	Other status offense

Other Offenses:

Parole violation	Traffic
Furlough violation	Other
Probation violation	

**Methodological Limitations**

Generally, juvenile's flow and attrition transpires sequentially through the nine juvenile justice system decision points (from arrest down to waiver). However, due to differences in resources and processing procedures between jurisdictions, there are a few significant county differences that exist across the State of Hawaii. These differences in procedure can account for mild discrepancies in data analyses.

Hawaii County Arrests and Referrals

Occasionally in Hawaii circuit, youth enter the juvenile justice system without having an arrest record documented in JJIS. When this occurs, police report the incident in which a juvenile(s) may have engaged in a form of a delinquency. The officer(s) will always fill out a police report if the incident merits further processing of the youth(s) through the juvenile justice system.

However, in some cases when officers feel there is adequate evidence, they will not arrest the youth(s). But instead "refer" the youth(s) directly to the prosecutor. From there, if the prosecutor determines there is sufficient evidence to prosecute the youth(s), the prosecutor will forward the necessary paperwork on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Circuit Family court and the process advances from there. When this process occurs, JJIS catalogues it as a "referral" without an arrest, which appears inconceivable on paper without understanding this unique systemic variation.

Lag Time Between Decision Points

Each fiscal year begins on July 1 and ends the following June 30. Inevitably, as the fiscal year turns over, some youth will be in the midst of going through different decision points in the juvenile justice system. For example, a youth may have been arrested on June 25, 2006 (end of fiscal year 2006) and not been referred until July 2, 2006 (beginning of fiscal year 2007). This situation can occur between any two decision points along the continuum.

In cases where this flow through the system occurs over the course of two fiscal years, it is impossible to examine one fiscal year and track a particular youth's attrition through the system for a unique fiscal year. In order to address this issue at least at the juncture between arrests and referrals, all referral cases were identified for each fiscal year. Each of those individual youths was then linked up with his/her arrest from that same fiscal year and/or the prior fiscal year as a means of tracking attrition more accurately at the earliest stage of the juvenile justice system.

### Ethnicity

JJIS allows each of its member agencies to enter up to five ethnicities for each youth. When police departments input ethnicity(ies) for an arrested youth, ethnicity may be determined by a youth's self-reported description, as expressed by family, or as determined by the police (e.g., through the youth's last name). This process can have obvious flaws, as it is extremely difficult to determine ethnicity in Hawaii, where a high proportion of youth come from multiple ethnic backgrounds.

If a youth progresses on to the referral stage, the Family Court asks that the youth's family bring in his/her birth certificate. In most cases, the birth certificate is provided (statistics are not maintained on how often), at which point the Family Court can more accurately determine the youth's ethnicity(ies). If a youth's family does not bring in a birth certificate, the family can verbally state the youth's ethnicity(ies).

As is common in most scholarly studies and political processes in Hawaii, if a youth was documented as "Hawaiian," he or she was counted in this report as Hawaiian, irrespective of whether or not the youth also held other ethnicities documented in JJIS. Again, this "one drop" rule, while imperfect, is the most common method of analyzing ethnicity in the State of Hawaii. Hawaiians have shown over-representation in Hawaii's juvenile and adult justice systems. This method inevitably contributes to Hawaiians' over-representation.

## **Analysis (State Fiscal Years 2009 to 2011)**

### **I.A. Arrest**

In 2009, arrests for the State of Hawaii totaled 15,293 and the arrest rate per 1,000 youth was 114.9 (refer to Table 1-1a in attachments); general population information on youth ages between 10 and 17 were taken from census 2010. The total number of arrests decreased in 2010 to 13,448 and the arrest rate 101.1. For 2011, the total number of arrests was 7,391 (Table 1-2a, with an arrest rate of 55.6. The arrest rates for the four circuits varied during the three-year period. Maui had the highest arrest rate in both 2009 (267), and 2010 (194.5). However in 2011, Kauai doubled that of Maui at a rate of 128.8 arrests per 1000 youth. Hawaii County followed closely behind with rates that are the third highest in the state. For all three years, Honolulu had the lowest arrest rates (2009, 75.2; 2010, 73.7; 2011, 43.7) compared to other counties.



### **Type of Offense**

Status offenses were the highest type of offense for the State of Hawaii (52%) in 2009. This resonated across the four circuits which all showed high percentages for status offenses. Status offenses for all three years for the state as well as the individual circuits made up for more than 40% to over 50% of all arrests. For all three years, Honolulu, Kauai, and Hawaii consistently showed property offenses as the second highest reason for arrest (refer to Table 1-1a). Maui diverted from the three counties for all three years indicating the “other” type of offense as the second highest.

A closer examination of the data by type of offense showed that Maui county made up a little less than 40% of all drug arrest for the state and around 50% for “other” offense type arrests (figure was calculated using the county/circuit data as numerator over state data) in 2009 and 2010. While Maui contributed to a high percentage of arrests for drug offenses statewide, drug offenses ranked 3<sup>rd</sup> in type of arrests made in 2010 and part of 2011 in the county. Hawaii circuit also showed drug offenses to be the third reason for arrest in 2009 (15.3%) and 2010 (14%), while Kauai fluctuated between drug and person offenses in arrests for third in 2009 and 2011.

Status offenses have consistently remained the highest offense type in arrests for all three years for all four circuits. All three of the circuits had property offenses as the second highest for all arrests across the three years with the exception of Maui that showed “other” to be the second highest. Maui circuit showed to have the largest percentage for drug and “other” offenses consistently for 2009 and 2010 years compared to the other counties.

Statewide data and the individual circuits showed a progressive decrease in arrest rates from 2009 to 2011 with the exception of Hawaii County which showed similar arrest rates from 2009 to 2010 but a noticeable decrease in 2011.

### **Gender**

Consistently throughout the three years, males were arrested more than females. As shown in the statewide data in 2009, there was a 22.2% difference between male and female arrests. However, subsequent years showed the difference to decrease (2010 16.6; 2011, 16.2). The individual circuits showed Hawaii County to have the highest rate of change (9%) from 2009 to 2010, and Kauai County with a 12.6 decrease from 2010 and 2011. All circuits showed a gender difference decrease with the exception of Maui County that showed a slight increase from 2009 to 2010. But between 2010 and 2011, a noticeable decrease was evident showing also that in Maui County, the difference in arrest based on gender is also decreasing.

### **Age**

As shown in Tables 1-1b, 1-2b, & 1-3b, a progressive increase is shown in arrests as age increases from 10 to 15. Furthermore, statewide and the individual circuit data showed that ages 14-17 accounts for nearly 70% or more of all arrests for the state as well as the individual circuits throughout the three years. The age group that shows to have the highest percentage of arrest varied between 15 and 16 depending on the year and county.

## **Race/Ethnicity**

Across all three years, Native Hawaiians were the group with the largest arrest percentage (range: 27% - 30%) statewide, followed by Caucasian (around 22%) and Filipino (around 20%). However when the arrest rates by ethnicity were compared to their respective ethnic proportion in the population based on the 2010 census data, only Native Hawaiians and Filipino rates showed an overrepresentation of these groups in arrests for all three years, in all four counties compared to their proportion in the population. Caucasian arrest rates showed an overrepresentation for Kauai in 2010 and 2011. Other ethnic groupings that were overrepresented in arrests relative to their proportion in the population were Samoan, African-American, and other Pacific Islander/Mixed Pacific Islander (refer to Tables 1-1b, 1-2b, 1-3b).

## **I.B. Referral**

The referral rate in 2009 for the State of Hawaii per 1000 youth was 81.5 (refer to Table 2-1a) and a steady decrease for 2010 (65.8) and 2011 (30.6) per 1000 youth (refer to Table 2-2a and 2-3a). Kauai had the highest referral rate for both 2009 and 2011 (223 and 74 respectively) followed by Maui at 153.1 in 2009, and Hawaii at a rate of 42.5 in 2011. In 2010, Hawaii had the highest referral rate of 113.4, with Maui (107.9) and Kauai (109.1) following close behind (refer to Table 2-2a). All three counties had over twice the rate of referrals compared to Honolulu for all three years. Referral rates for Honolulu remained the lowest of all the other circuits during the three years (2009, 53.8; 2010, 46.5; 2011, 26.5).

## **Type of Offense**

Status offenses accounted for more than half of all referrals (refer to Table 2-1a) statewide for all three years. All four circuits showed high percentages of referrals for status offenses with Honolulu being the highest (range: 57% to 65%). For Maui, Hawaii, and Kauai, status offenses accounted for 40% or more of all referrals for each year. For Maui, Kauai, and Hawaii, property offenses accounted for the second highest referrals (range: 18% to 22%). With the exception of 2010, Honolulu's second highest reason for referral was "other" types of offense in 2009 and 2011. The third largest offense type for referrals is "other" for Kauai and Maui for all three years. Drug offenses were the third largest reason for referrals in the Hawaii circuit (11.6%) for all three years.

Overall, all four circuits showed that the largest percentage of their referrals were of status offenses. Honolulu had the largest percentage and consistently showed status offenses accounting for over 50% of their referrals. Given the population of youth ages 10-17 in Honolulu, the proportion of referrals for each offense would show Honolulu to be high given their proportion in the state. However, several types of offenses show other counties to exceed those of Honolulu. Such offenses include drug and person NC for Maui for 2009. Similarly, drug offenses for the Hawaii circuit in both 2010 (38%) and 2011 (46%) contributed to a substantial percentage of referrals for the State of Hawaii. For 2011, Kauai circuit alone accounted for 33% of referrals for Person NC offenses.

## **Gender**

Males were consistently higher in referrals compared to females for all circuits across all years (refer to Tables 2-1b, 2-2b, 2-3b). The difference between the genders increased from 2009 to

2010 with a slight decrease in 2011 for the state. Kauai circuit had the highest (27% or more) percentage difference between the genders for 2009 and 2010 while Honolulu circuit had the least (11 to 14%) difference for all three years. Maui (22.6%) had the second largest percentage difference in 2011 and second largest for 2009 and 2010. While Hawaii showed over 20% gender difference in referrals for 2009 and 2010, the differences in gender decreased to 15% in referrals for 2011.

### **Age**

Over 60% of all arrests for the state consist of youth within the age of 15 to 17 throughout the three years; a pattern that is also reflected in the arrests proportions for each county (refer to Tables 2-1b, 2-2b, 2-3b). Age 14 is also an age worth noting, as the percentage of referrals within this age group accounts for a noticeable proportion of referrals within each county. As shown in the following tables, the jumps in referrals from age 13 to 14 are quite substantial for each county as well as for the state.

### **Race/Ethnicity**

The largest referral group by far for all years, across all circuits as well as statewide, was Hawaiian youth (refer to Tables 2-1b, 2-2b, 2-3b) with the exception of 2011 in which the number of referrals of Caucasian youth (27%) were slightly higher than that of Hawaiian (26%) for the county of Hawaii. State data as well as individual county data for 2009 and 2010 showed the second largest ethnic group in referrals was Caucasian (22-23%) for all counties except Honolulu. For all three years, Filipino youth (16% & 18%) were consistently the second largest in referrals for the Honolulu County, and the third largest in referrals for the state and the other three counties.

It is important to note that the state, Hawaii and Kauai circuits' data showed substantial percentage across the three years of "unknown" ethnicity. As shown in the following tables, for all three years, it's the fourth largest group in referrals statewide and in the Hawaii circuit, and third for Kauai. This warrants further study as this category in the referral decision point should be little to non-existent as the referral stage requires a birth certificate to verify demographic information such as ethnicity.

Relative to their proportion in the population for the state, Native Hawaiian youth continues to show a substantial overrepresentation in referrals in all counties as well as the state. Although the statewide data, showed a decrease in referrals for Filipino youth over the years (2009, 18%; 2010, 17%; 2011, 16%), the percentages still shows an overrepresentation based on their proportion in the population. However, the overrepresentation of Filipino youth in the referral phase shows only in the Maui and Honolulu consistently over the three years. Kauai circuit didn't show an overrepresentation for years 2010 and 2011, but showed up in the Hawaii circuit for 2009 and 2011. Another ethnic grouping that continues to show overrepresentation is that of the "Other Pacific Islander/Mixed Pacific Islander (OPI/MPI)" for all three years as shown in the state data. In all three years, the OPI/MPI ethnicity groupings were overrepresented in Honolulu and Maui circuits. The overrepresentation of this ethnic grouping was shown in Kauai for only 2009. Another group that were consistently overrepresented in referrals according to the statewide data is Samoan for all three years, this pattern was also reflected in the referral data for

all four circuits in 2010 and 2011 with the exception of Maui. African-Americans also were overrepresented in all years for all circuits.

### **I.C. Diversion**

The findings reported are a snapshot of diversion data for years 2009, 2010, and 2011 as collected and reported by the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS). This means that cases in diversion may or may not have been in the referral data for the three year period included in the analysis.

A total of 4,046 cases in 2009 were in diversion or informally handled for a rate of 30.4 per 1000 youth between the ages of 10-17 (refer to Table 3-1a). Honolulu (23.5) was below the diversion rate. The Maui (30.7) rate was very similar to that of the state. Kauai showing a substantially higher (48.1) rate than the state, with Hawaii (60.7) having the highest diversion rate.

In 2010, a total of 5,078 cases were diverted or informally handled which translates into a statewide diversion rate of 38.2 per 1000. This is an increase from 2009 (refer to Table 3-2a). Kauai (91.4) had the highest diversion rate while Honolulu (26.2) showed the lowest diversion rate compared to other circuits.

Total number of diversion cases (3,074) decreased in 2011, with a diversion rate of 23.1 (refer to Table 3-3a). Hawaii (47.6) and Kauai (44.2) diversion rates were the highest with Maui (14.7) showing the lowest followed by Honolulu (18.9) in diversion rates.

For all three years Hawaii and Kauai circuits reported substantially higher diversion rates compared to other circuits.

### **Type of Offense**

The highest percentages of diversion cases across the years for all circuits were for status offenses. Approximately 90% or more of the diversion cases for the Honolulu and 80% or more for Kauai circuits. For all counties, status offenses made up a large percentage of cases that were in the diversion phase. For all three years, all circuits showed property offenses as the second highest in diversion. Hawaii circuit, however, showed the largest percentage of diversion drug offenses compared to other circuits.

### **Gender**

Diversion percentages were higher for males than females both statewide and for Maui, Hawaii, and Kauai but were close for Honolulu across all three years. The data also showed Kauai to have the largest percentage difference (20.4%) in 2009, Hawaii (20%) in 2010, and Maui (20%) in 2011. Honolulu showing a significantly lower percentage difference (1% to 3%) compared to the other circuits across all three years.

### **Age**

The modal age in diversion was 15 in 2009 and 16 in 2010 both statewide and for all circuits. A multimodal occurred in 2010 where age 15 and 16 were both the largest age group in diversion

for the Maui circuit. For 2011, age 16 was the largest group statewide and for Honolulu and Maui. However, for Hawaii and Kauai, age 17 was the largest group in diversion.

### **Race/Ethnicity**

Hawaiian youth showed the highest percentage for diversion statewide for all three years and across all circuits for only 2009. In 2010, all but Maui showed Native Hawaiian youth as the largest ethnic group in diversion. Maui in 2010 and Kauai in 2011 had Caucasian as the largest group in diversion. Filipino was the second largest only in Honolulu for 2009 and 2010.

OPI/MPI proportion in diversion was the fourth largest in Honolulu and Maui circuits for all three years. Of concern, is that of the “unknown” category which shows a substantial amount for the Kauai and Hawaii circuits; a pattern that is consistent with prior phases.

A further examination of the data shows that while Honolulu and Maui showed an overrepresentation of Filipino youth in diversion across the three years, Hawaii and Kauai percentages consistently showed an underrepresentation of these youth in diversion. Samoans and African-Americans also showed an overrepresentation in diversion throughout the three years. African-Americans were consistently overrepresented in all counties throughout the three years while Samoans were overrepresented mainly in the Honolulu and Hawaii circuits at the diversion phase.

### **I.D. Petition (Formally Handled)**

The number of petition cases in the state totaled to 5,015, with a petition rate of 37.7 per 1000 youth in 2009. The rates across the circuits varied greatly (refer to Table 4-1a, 4-2a, and 4-3a). Kauai (115 and Maui (98.2) had much higher petition rate than Hawaii (24.9) and Honolulu (24.1). In 2010, the number of petition cases statewide decreased to 4,194 with a rate of 31.5. Maui (84.7) had the highest petition rate and Honolulu with the lowest (20.3). By September 2011, the number of petition cases decreased to 1,762 with a rate of 13.2. Kauai (42.7) showed the highest petition rate while Honolulu remained the circuit with the lowest rate of 10.3.

### **Type of Offense**

For the City and County of Honolulu, the largest offense type in the petition phase was in the “other” offense category across all three years (refer to Table 4-1a, 4-2a, 4-3a). In addition, Hawaii and Kauai circuits had the most cases petitioned for property offenses for all three years while Maui showed status offenses as the largest type of offense that were petitioned to family court. Hawaii and Kauai circuits showed property offenses as the largest percentage of cases in the petition phase within their respective circuits for all three years.

The top four offenses that were petitioned for the Honolulu circuit were “other,” status, property, and personal offenses. Maui and Hawaii circuits had similar top four, which were status, other, property, and drug offenses. The top four for Kauai were property, other, person and drug offenses. The 2011 data also showed Person NC offenses for Kauai as having a similar percentage with drug offenses.

### **Gender**

More males were formally handled than females for all three years (refer to Table 4-1b, 4-2b, 4-3b). Similar to the statewide data, the Honolulu circuit showed differences between the genders to 30% or more for all three years. This is a contrast from data in previous phases (arrests, referrals, diversion) that showed Honolulu circuit to have the least difference between the genders. All circuits reflected a percentage difference between the genders of more than 30% in 2009 with Kauai showing the highest difference (44.6%) in 2010.

### **Age**

Statewide percentage showed 17 as the modal age for all three years for having the highest petition (refer to table 4-1b, 4-2b, 4-3b). This trend was reflected in all circuits in 2009 and 2010 with the exception of Hawaii in 2009 that showed 16 as the modal age. Also of note is the 2011 data that showed age 14 as the second highest in the petition phase for Hawaii in 2011. Overall the three age groups that are consistently high in petition throughout the three years, in all of the circuits are ages 15, 16, and 17.

### **Race/Ethnicity**

Hawaiian youth have the highest percentage of petitions (30% or more) compared to other ethnic groups across all circuit for all three years (refer to Table 4-1b, 4-2b, 4-3b). While Caucasians accounted for the second or third highest in petitions, their petition rates remain below their proportion in the population. Filipino youth were also either the second or third largest group in petitions throughout the three years across the circuits. For 2009 and 2010, proportion of Filipino youth in petition exceeded their proportion in the population statewide and across all circuits with the exception of the Hawaii circuit in 2010. Interestingly, data for 2011 showed that with the exception of Honolulu, all circuits including statewide data showed Filipino percentage in petition to be below their population proportion.

The Mixed Pacific Islander group continues to be overrepresented according to the statewide and Honolulu circuit data throughout the three years. Samoan youth were also overrepresented in petition compared to their proportion in the population. The Honolulu data shows the most glaring disproportionality of Samoan youth petition. Their percentages in petition ranged from 5 to 8 times more than that of their proportion in the state (1.3) as well as for Honolulu (1.8) across the three years. The “unknown” category also yielded a high percentage in this phase. This continues to be a concern as legal documentations are used to verify youth identity at this stage.

### **I.E. Detention**

Detention rates were the highest in 2009 (1,074) of 8.1 per 1000 youth. It declined to a rate of 6.3 (844) in 2010. For part of 2011, the rate decreased to about half of 2009 (N=517, rate of 3.9 per 1000 youth). (Note: Hawaii became a JDAI site in the latter part of 2008)

### **Type of Offense**

Data on type of offenses and circuits were not available at the time of this report.

## **Gender**

There was substantially larger percentage of males compared to females in detention consistently across the years (35% or more: Table 5-1). The highest difference was in 2011 of 42%.

## **Age**

The modal age for youth was 17 for 2009 (34.3%) and 2010 (39.1%), and age 16 (33.6%) for 2011. The top three age groups throughout the three years were ages 15, 16, and 17.

## **Race/Ethnicity**

Hawaiian youth were consistently the highest group in detention statewide for all three years, from 36.1% in 2009, dropping slightly to 34.2% in 2010, and remaining about the same in 2011 (34.5%). Caucasians are the second largest group in detention. The third largest group was Filipinos, followed by Samoans and other Pacific Islander/Mixed Pacific Islander. Given the proportions of each ethnicity in the population of the state, Hawaiians and Samoans were the only two ethnic groups that were significantly overrepresented in detention for all three years with the exception of the Mixed Pacific Islander group that were also overrepresented in years 2009 and 2011.

## **I.F. Adjudications**

In 2009, adjudications for the state totaled 1,979 and the adjudication rate per 1,000 youth was 14.9 (refer to Table 6-1a). The total number of adjudications increased in 2010 to 2,358 (17.7) and decreased in 2011 to 1,598 (12). The adjudication rates for the four circuits varied greatly (refer to Table 6-1a, 6-2a, 6-3a). Kauai circuit rate was the highest in 2009 (43.8) and again in 2010 (45.1), and tied Maui at the adjudication rate of 24 per 1,000 youth for the highest in 2011. Honolulu was the lowest all three years with 12.4 in 2009, 12.1 in 2010, and 7.6 in 2011.

## **Type of offense**

Status offenses were the highest type of offense adjudicated for the stat (32.4%) in 2009, and the following two years changed to property offenses (28.7% and 27.2% respectively). Person and other types of offenses showed high percentages in adjudication as shown in the statewide data. The Honolulu circuit showed that for all three years, status offenses were the highest type of offense in adjudication with property offenses following behind as the second highest for years 2009 and 2010. Person and other types of offenses were also among the top four offenses in adjudication for Honolulu. Similar to Honolulu for 2009 and 2010, status offenses were the highest offense in adjudication for Maui. In 2011 it was the second highest. "Other" and drug offenses were also among the top four in adjudication for Maui.

For all three years, the highest offense type in adjudication for Hawaii was property. Second and third highest offense fluctuated between status offenses and "other." Drug offenses remained the fourth across all three years.

Similar to the Hawaii circuit, Kauai showed property offenses as its highest offense in adjudication for all three years. Personal and "other types of offenses were also among the top four in adjudication for all three years. While status offenses was the third highest for adjudication in the Kauai circuit for only 2009, the percentage decreased by a noticeable amount

to 2010 and 2011. The two latter years also showed drug offenses as one of the top four offenses in adjudication for Kauai.

Property and status offenses have consistently remained one of the top three highest offense types in adjudication for all three years for all circuits except for Kauai. Property offenses for all three years for the state as well as the individual circuits made up nearly a quarter or more of all adjudications. Similarly, status offenses showed a similar trend in the Honolulu and Maui circuits. Maui circuit had the largest percentage for drug offenses for all three years compared to other circuits.

### **Gender**

Consistently throughout the three years, male cases were adjudicated at a higher rate than females. In general, the differentiation ranged from 20% to 42.2%. In 2009, with Kauai circuit showing the least difference of 20% which was lower than the statewide spread of 31% (refer to table 6-1b). Hawaii showed the greatest difference in percentages between males and females of 42.2%. In 2010, Kauai circuit showed the largest difference in adjudications (42.6%) between males and females while Maui circuit showed the least spread of 22/8% (refer to Table 6-2b). In 2011, Honolulu had the largest difference of 31.6% (which was greater than the statewide percentage difference of 28.2%) with Maui showing the least at 24.2% (refer to Table 6-3b).

### **Age**

In 2009, all circuits showed 17 to have the highest percentage of adjudications compared to other age groups, ranging from 30% to 41% (refer to Table 6-1b). Similar to the state data, Honolulu, Hawaii, and Kauai circuits showed age 16 to be the second highest, followed by 15.

The statewide data along with Maui and Kauai for 2010 showed the same trend as in 2009. However, for Hawaii and Honolulu circuits age 16 was the modal age followed by 17 and then 15.

In 2011, age 17 had the highest rate statewide (30.9%), and was the largest group in Hawaii (35.2%) and Maui (40%) circuits. Age group 15 had the highest rate of adjudications in Honolulu (28.0%), and age group 16 for Kauai (29%).

### **Race/Ethnicity**

All three years indicated Native Hawaiians to make up the largest percentage of adjudications (30% or more) for each circuit. Caucasian and Filipino were the next largest two groups both statewide and across all circuits. The “unknown” category continues to be relatively high for Hawaii (ranging from 12.0% to 18.6%). For Honolulu, the next group with the highest percentage was Samoans (8.9%) followed by Japanese (7.8%) and Mixed Pacific Islander (7.2%) in 2009.

In subsequent years, Samoans were either the fourth or fifth largest ethnicity in adjudication (refer to Table 6-1b, 2b, 3b).



Native Hawaiians consistently are disproportionately high in adjudication compared to their numbers in the population and in the respective counties. Filipinos are consistently overrepresented in Honolulu and Maui circuits in adjudications across all three years. Although they were overrepresented for Hawaii and Kauai circuits in 2009, the overrepresentation disappears in subsequent years. Samoans were also overrepresented in adjudication compared to their proportion in the population as indicated by the statewide data as well as Honolulu and Hawaii circuits for all three years. The Mixed Pacific Islander group not only shows an overrepresentation in the statewide data and Honolulu and Maui, but also in Kauai for 2009 and 2010. African-Americans were disproportionately represented in all circuits across all years.

### **I.G. Probation**

The total number of cases in probation for 2009 was 914, 808 in 2010, and 506 in 2011 (refer to Table 7-1a, 7-2a, 7-3a). The probation rate statewide was the highest in 2009 (6.9 per 1000 youth) followed by a similar rate in 2010 (6.1) with a decrease in 2011 of 4.2. Hawaii circuit had the highest probation rates for all three years, with rates of 15.0 in 2009, 14.0 in 2010, and 8.9 in 2011, while Honolulu showed the lowest probation rates (2009, 4.8; 2010, 3.9; 2011, 2.6).

#### **Type of Offense**

For 2009 and 2011, the probation percentage was the highest for status offenses in the state and all circuits except for Kauai where property and/or “other” types of offenses were the highest. Property offenses were either the first or second largest in adjudication for all circuits with the exception of Hawaii in 2009 in which property offenses was the third largest offense in adjudication for Hawaii.

“Other” type of offenses ranked among the top four for Hawaii and Kauai across the three years. Hawaii and Maui circuits consistently showed drug offenses as one of the top four in probation for each year. Person offenses were the second highest for Kauai throughout the years, while Honolulu showed person offenses as either the largest (2011) or the third largest in probation (2009 & 2010).

#### **Gender**

Males made up over two thirds (2009 & 2011, 65%; 2010, 66%) of the probation population statewide (refer to Table 7-1b, 2b, 3b). Kauai circuit showed the most fluctuation in gender difference across the years. It had the least difference in percentage between male and female (12%) in 2009, but in 2010 showed the highest gender difference throughout in probation (45%). Hawaii circuit showed consistency in gender difference throughout the years with percentages ranging from the low to high 30x. In 2011, Maui showed the lowest gender difference of 18% as compared to the previous years that showed about a 30% difference.

#### **Age**

From 2009 to 2011, the modal youth age at probation statewide, Kauai, and Maui circuits is 16 (refer to Table 7-1b, 2b, 3b). Honolulu circuit showed age 14 to have the most cases in probation compared to other ages in 2009, and then increased to age 15 in 2010 and 2011. In addition throughout the three years, Honolulu circuit consistently showed that about 11 to 12

percent of those in probation are 113 years old. Age groups 14 to 17 continue to account for 75% or more of the ages in probation.

### **Race/Ethnicity**

All three years indicated Native Hawaiians to have the largest percentage of probations (ranging from about 30-47%) for each circuit with Caucasian and Filipino showing the second and/or third highest percentages. For all three years, the “unknown” category was the third highest (range 15 to 17%) for the Hawaii circuit. Native Hawaiian showed the highest overrepresentation of youth in probation compared to their proportion in the population. Additionally, African-American, Mixed Pacific Islander, and Samoan youth were not only overrepresented in probation statewide, but in other circuits throughout the three years. In 2009, Filipino showed an overrepresentation in probation for the Honolulu circuit only. However, in 2010 & 2011, the statewide data, and all but the Hawaii circuit showed Filipino to also be overrepresented in probation.

### **I.H. HYCF (secure confinement)**

In 2009 HYCF mandates for the state totaled 160, at a rate of 1.3 per 1,000 youth (refer to Table 8-1a). In 2010 and 2011 a visible decrease was shown to 117 (.9) and 86 (.6) respectively.

### **Type of Offense**

2009 through 2011 showed “other” type of offenses accounted for almost half or more of the offenses in HYCF placement across all three years (range: 47% to 55%), followed by property offenses (range: 22% to 32%) and then person offenses (range: 12% to 14%) (refer to Table 8-1a).

### **Gender**

Consistently throughout the three years, over 70% of the cases in HYCF were males. In 2009 and 2011, the differentiation percentage between male and female was 56%. This percentage decreased in 2010 to 44%.

### **Age**

Ages represented in HYCF ranged from 14 to 17 with the exception of 2010 in which one 13 year old was placed in HYCF. From 2009 through 2011, the modal age was 17 (range: 47% to 49%) statewide with 16 being the second largest. Age 14 represented the least percentage in HYCF (range: 3% to 4%).

### **Race/Ethnicity**

All three years indicated Native Hawaiians to have the largest percentage of HYCF placements, from 39.7% in 2009, to 47.8% in 2010, and then 55.3% in 2011. Caucasians were the second largest showing a steady decrease over the years. Filipinos were the third largest group statewide, followed by Mixed Pacific Islander for fourth.

Ethnic groups that were overrepresented in HYCF relative to their proportion in the population were Native Hawaiians, Mixed Pacific Islanders, and Samoans across the three years. African-Americans also showed disproportionality in HYCF for 2009 only.

## **I.I. Transfer or Waiver to Adult Court**

No waiver to adult court was reported for youth ages 10 – 17 during 2009, 2010, and 2011.

### **Youth Gangs in Hawaii**

JJIS maintains no information on gang affiliation or influence. Any gang related information pertinent to Hawaii residents is forwarded by Hawaii's Police Department to the federal authorities through a system called the Western States Information Network. Thus, discerning the level of gang activity among Hawaii youth through JJIS is not possible. Information on youth gangs in Hawaii for this report is based on the available literature.

Youth gangs impact the communities they thrive in, and the families they originate from. Gangs impact the community by increasing violent and criminal activity as well as decreasing the moral and feelings of safety amongst community members. On a national level the Los Angeles juvenile justice website reports, "Gangs exist in urban areas and more recently even in the rural areas as well. They number well over a quarter million youths throughout the country" LAPD (2012). Thus, on a local level youth gangs are not only a problem for the urban areas of Honolulu; they affect communities in rural areas of Oahu and all neighbor islands.

In 2003, an analysis of the Hawaii Student Alcohol, Tobacco, and Drug Use surveys from the 2000 data set by Chesney-Lind, Pasko, Marker, Freeman, and Nakano (2004) found that students from both urban and rural areas scored high on "gang involvement". However contributors and risk factors for gang involvement differ from rural to urban communities. "In rural areas such as Kau, Leileihua, Lanai, Hana, Kohala, and Keaa family factors are salient, while urban areas such as Campbell, Waipahu, Farrington personal factors like risk taking behaviors (such as selling drugs) and involvement with delinquent peer groups yielded comparatively higher reports" (Chesney-Lind et al. 2004, P. 36). These numbers do not mean anything to the public unless there is an understanding of how detrimental gang activity is to the youth involved, their families, and the public as a whole.

According to the Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Youth Violence National and State Statistics at a Glance (2009), a total of 650,843 young people ages 10 – 24 years were treated in emergency departments for nonfatal injuries sustained from assaults." Furthermore, a literature review by Godinet, Mayeda, & Arnsberger (2006 – 2008) found, "gang association, past or present, has significant and positive correlation with delinquency among Hawaii youth" (p.55). Hawaii is an example of a state with many types of gangs made up of youth who join these groups for a variety of reasons. In order to prevent, intervene, and decrease the magnitude of gangs in Hawaii it is important to identify why they are so prevalent and why youth partake in gang activity.

The literature on gangs identifies risk factors common amongst youth who are in gangs and reasons why they join. The common assumptions are that youth join to "be cool", for economic gain, or to feel a sense of family and connectedness they are not finding at home. Gangs function for youth as an extension of the family that also provides protection from the environmental conditions prevalent in many communities with high gang membership. Other factors also include traditions in which youth are involved in gangs they want to follow in the

footsteps of their family members who are also in a gang, or may also be coerced into joining. The LAPD (2012) website points out “gang involvement can begin as early as elementary school. Children as young as seven or eight years of age have been recruited to work in criminal street gangs” (LAPD, 2012). This information tells us that intervention programs need to reach children of all ages as well as families. Youth in Hawaii join gangs for similar reasons as youth in other states. However, attention also needs to be given to the variety of cultures in which gang members are immersed. Such communities are at high risk because if systems such as schools, families, and the police are not able to nurture the youth, they will turn to their peers. An occurrence that is frequent in communities that are highly transitional because of immigration and/or chronic poverty (Vigil, 2002).

### Hawaii Youth Gangs

Gangs in Hawaii are made up of youth from many cultural backgrounds, and according to LAPD (2012), “Gangs often form along ethnic and racial lines, although there is an increasing trend of young people joining gangs for economic motives” (The Center for Youth Research, 2004, p. 90). Both racial lines and economic motives are related to Hawaii’s history of immigration. Hawaii’s rich immigration history explains the variety of gangs formed by racial commonalities. The most recent group to have immigrated is generally the one struggling to assimilate. Today, Hawaii is experiencing a large number families emigrating from the various nations within the Micronesia geographical location. This group continues to experience discrimination from the local community as well as from other immigrant groups. This places them at a high risk for gang involvement due to the need for protection from other groups. As found in a report from the Office of Youth Services immigrant groups stick together for protection when they become a target of violence for another group (Chesney-Lind, Pasko, Marker, Matsen, Lawyer, Johnson, Gushiken, and Freeman, 2005). Other risk factors that language barriers, substance abuse, and high drop-out rates.

Nonetheless not all youth who are immigrants who live in poverty-stricken areas become gang members. According to a study by Okamoto et al. (2008) youth may have cultural buffers such as traditional activities that decrease the chance a youth will join a gang. Family involvement has been found to decrease youth involvement in gangs as well as school and police involvement. This idea is supported by Godinet et al (2006 – 2008), as the review found, “resources that connect immigrant and economically distressed families to schools and the police in positive manners.

### Consequences of Gang Activities

Youth gangs are commonly involved in criminal activity such as selling drugs, prostitution, theft, and other illegal actions affecting their peers, families, and the general public. The Center for Youth Research Project, (2005) found, an alarming trend that was reported at the most recent meeting of the YGRS (Youth Gang Response System) (November 30, 2004). Youth involved in gangs were from Kuhio Park Terrace (a subsidized housing project) were “targeting” tourists and members of the military, and picking fights with strangers sometimes motivated by robbery (State Office of Youth Services, 2004, p. 6). This is a concern because aspects such as the tourist industry will be affected if citizens fear gang violence and robbery. As the economy continues to spiral down gang activity may become more economically motivated thus increasing robbery,

drug smuggling, and prostitution. Chesney-Lind et al (2004) pointed out that youth who are highly attached to delinquent peer groups and low attachment to positive family relations, also are experiencing low attachment to school, low to no commitment to education, and poor grades: (p. 20). If youth in Hawaii are not graduating from high school they may be more likely to remain in a gang and use gang activity as their means of income. Overall risk factors as well as factors that maintain the cyclical nature of gangs both need to be targeted to combat gangs.

Literature reviews and studies have found a collaborative approach has the highest success rate in addressing gangs. Looking to areas with similar cultural factors as Hawaii may provide insight into what works and does not work for youth gangs. New Zealand youth gangs are made up of Maori youth as well as youth of various ethnicities. The New Zealand Parliament website explains reasons for youth gangs: “Youth gangs and youth delinquency appear to be related to economic deprivation with gangs more likely to grow in depressed or disorganized communities lacking a sense of pride. In such communities the parents’ engagement with their children can be limited by their long work hours and financial pressures” (2009). Youth gangs in Hawaii have become a coping mechanism for youth who are not thriving in their homes or communities. The spectrum of factors that propel gang involvement is wide and makes it difficult to determine what interventions are most effective. Reviewing what the state is currently doing to address youth gangs as well as needs that are not being met may help to identify the most effective approach to decreasing youth gangs.

#### Strategies to Reduce Problems associated with Youth Gangs

Youth gang prevention programs usually follow one of three approaches, prevention, intervention, or suppression. According to the New Zealand Parliament website (2009) and evaluation of comprehensive gang programs in the U.S. concluded that, when properly implemented, a combination of prevention, intervention, and suppression strategies was successful in reducing the gang problem”. In 2008, the Los Angeles City Controller submitted a blueprint for a comprehensive citywide anti-gang strategy that focused on better coordination and collaboration of existing programs rather than streamlining or allocating monies for additional programs. The rationale states, “since each of the City’s communities affected by gangs is unique and different [similar to Hawaii gangs], the societal infrastructure and individual needs of each area will vary. Only through a comprehensive, community-level and citywide department-level needs assessment will the City be able to marshal the appropriate mix of youth development and anti-gang services to address the underlying causes of each community’s gang problem” (p. 2). The ability for programs to be able to shift their intervention model and to be able to collaborate with various programs for youth and families is beneficial in Hawaii as gangs range from urban centered local Hawaiian gangs, to rural gangs, to gangs comprised on one ethnic group bound together by discrimination, to gangs created to model a mainland gang. The approach described in the Blueprint calls for a comprehensive approach similar to the approach supported by Howell & Curry (2009) involving mobilization and community organization.

A review of the literature on community mobilizing programs found, “grassroots organizations that grow out of personal ties between neighbors have a particular promise and resilience in mobilizing communities” (Howell and Curry, 2009, p.11). This study found that in order for grassroots programs to work and for communities to begin to mobilize and create change, the

criminal justice system needed to be involved. Howell and Curry (2009) evaluated various programs that used community organizing and found, “gaining cooperation between police and probation can be a daunting task. Still, it was accomplished at three of the sites” (p. 15). Currently, Hawaii embodies grass roots organizations, faith based organizations, and programs contracted by the state and federally funded programs. The Office of Youth Services (OYS) coordinates services to prevent juvenile delinquency. One of the five programs the OYS is focusing on is the Youth Gang Response System (YGRS).

The YGRS (2012) “was created to address youth gang behavior and related issues through a comprehensive and coordinated effort. The YGRS builds and maintains partnerships between public and private sector organizations to provide meaningful and positive opportunities for youth engaging in emerging or more serious gang behavior.” The YGRS strives to work collaboratively with other programs, however; funding cuts, competition for program funding, as well as disagreements on program implementation due to programs individual motives can create friction and decrease overall effectiveness.

One program that has been found to be effective in other states is Big Brothers Big Sisters. In 2008, the California Mentor Foundation surveyed mentoring programs that met standards of a background check, orientation, training, and support to the mentoring relationship. “The survey targeted youth who had been matched to a mentor for 12 months and asked questions that focused on school attendance, teen parenting, and drug usage and gang involvement. A total of 244 programs, including Big Brothers Big sisters, monitoring 28,204 matches were included in the analysis. The survey responses revealed that 97.2% stayed in school, 95.7% did not use drugs, 99.1% deterred from teen pregnancy, and 95.9% did not join a gang or act out violently. These figures are consistent with the results of three previous surveys conducted by the California Mentor Foundation over the last decade” (Governors office of gang and youth violence policy, 2012).

#### 2012 Legislature: Possible Implications for Youth Gang Prevention

The OYS 2010 report states, “the OYS funded youth gang prevention and intervention services that included development and implementation of community response teams and gang mediation services. Targeted were youth ages 11-18 who were engaging in either emergent or more serious gang behavior” (OYS 2010 Annual Report). The programs predominantly targeting youth gangs include Adult friends for Youth and the City and County of Honolulu. According to the 2010 report generated by OYS focused on community mobilization efforts, strategies for gang prevention and intervention, and formal mediation services for youth gang members.

Community mobilization as well as comprehensive interventions has been found to be useful strategies. The New Zealand Parliament website (2009) revealed, “An evaluation of comprehensive gang programs in the U.S. concluded that, when properly implemented, a combination of prevention, intervention, and suppression strategies was successful in reducing the gang problem”. It is difficult to determine how effective strategies are with youth gangs in Hawaii despite their success in other countries or states because Hawaii has a different culture and varying degree of gangs across the state. The 2012 Hawaii State Legislature is in the process

of passing bills to address communities and families at risk for factors that contribute to youth gangs. HB 1512 Relating to the Weed and Seed Strategy states, “there is established within the Office of Community Services the weed and seed strategy to reduce crime and improve the quality of life for residents and neighborhoods in the state. The weed and seed strategy shall be a collaborative effort among community residents, law enforcement agencies, social service providers, educators, area businesses, and other resource agencies and support organizations to: create, initiate, implement. And support responsible community-based activities, projects, and services that help reduce crime and drug use in neighborhoods; engage members of the community to encourage the development and maintenance of economic and social well-being and teach and model collaborative efforts that focus on sustainable results.” (House of Representatives Twenty-Sixth Legislature, 2011, p. 3). This Bill aligns with the community organizing theory on addressing gangs. Gang intervention should be implemented at all levels in order to address the issues surrounding gang involvement.

It is therefore all the more relevant that programs not only need to work collaboratively with one another but also utilize best practice based on what has been proven to work with populations similar to the population the specific program serves. Thus, gathering of relevant data through a program monitoring mechanism to assess feasibility and success or not of programs in Hawaii becomes a necessity.

### **Recommendation for Data Reporting**

#### **Unknown Ethnicity**

A significant number of youth are identified ethnically as “unknown” through virtually every level of Hawaii’s juvenile justice system. This can be expected at the level of arrest, as police are not always equipped to accurately input a youth’s ethnicity(ies). However, even at the arrest level and especially through the subsequent juvenile justice system stages, it is critical that how ethnicity is reported and categorized follows a common process.

#### **Consistent Processing through the Juvenile Justice System**

The other major concern with data reporting lies in the different ways that youth are processed through the system. As noted previously, in some counties, arrests can be bypassed and youth enter the system for the first time at the referral level. Ostensibly, this can also occur if schools are able to refer youth to prosecutors for status offenses, such as truancy. When an arrest is not made, it skews data analyses by increasing the overall proportion between referrals and arrests. This in turn makes county comparisons problematic.

It also is unclear how different types of diversions are entered into JJIS, if they are entered at all. In meetings with service providers, it was determined that diversions to community services immediately following arrest are rarely entered in some counties. Additionally, diversions can occur after a youth is referred to Family Court or after he or she has been adjudicated. The point at which a youth is diverted within the juvenile justice system needs to be noted in JJIS so that flow through the system can be accurately assessed.

Broadly speaking, when different circuits take different approaches to processing youth through their respective systems, comparative analyses are highly problematic. Granted counties have

different resources available in the way of staff and organizations. Still, it would benefit the state to have it juvenile justice system function as consistently as possible across all four counties when it comes to reporting data accurately and using data for strategic planning.

#### Missing Detention & HYCF Data

Detention data by circuit and type of offenses were missing for all three years. Thus, the type of offenses committed in detention was not known and from which circuit. HYCF data was also missing information on the circuit. Information, therefore, on the circuit origin of the case that ended up in HYCF was unknown for this report.

#### Issues with Data Files

Raw data files provided for the analysis has been a challenge with regards to cleaning and interpretation to be analysis ready. The data received in its original form was difficult to understand and in several instances information for one phase was in another. For example, in the access database, tables that included the referral tables showed a lot fewer cases than the previous years (almost half). This was a concern and what we discovered with the help of JJIS, was that the referral table only captures non-judicial referrals, which are actually the diversion data.

Other issues such as coding of the variables were difficult to decipher. While they make sense to internal JJIS data managers, they are not intuitive for external researchers. A recommendation to address this concern is to provide external researchers a codebook that deciphers the variable labels and codes.

#### **Recommended Problem Statement**

The following problem statements are based on the data analysis from the perspective of the authors.

##### 1. Status Offenders

The results of the analysis consistently showed status offenses as the highest type of offense in arrests and referrals. While findings showed a large percentage of status offenses diverted at the family court level, subsequent phases (petition, probation, and adjudication) continue to show status offenses as either the highest or second highest for Honolulu, Maui, and Hawaii circuits. In either the highest or second highest for Honolulu, Maui, and Hawaii circuits. In 2009 and 2010 almost 3% of the offenses in HYCF were status offenders. This warrants further examination for practice as well as for future analysis because type of offense was analyzed using duplicate counts. The status offense might be one of multiple offenses committed by the same youth. This is particularly important to ascertain in phases such as petition, probation, and adjudication, and HYCF as it is a concern that status offenses are being processed this far into the juvenile justice system.

##### 2. Type of Offenses

Property and other offenses were consistently among the top two or three across the four circuits, across all years, for all phases. Drug offenses were consistently high for Hawaii circuit and



among the top four to Maui and Kauai for all phases. It is clear, particularly for Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai circuits, substance abuse services are necessary to address the problem.

### 3. Overrepresentation

Native Hawaiian youth continue to make up a large proportion in all the decision points of Hawaii's juvenile justice system. Although Filipino and Caucasian groups were either second or third highest in different decision points, Filipino were overrepresented in almost all circuits except for Hawaii relative to their proportion in the population in all phases except for Detention and HYCF. Samoans were overrepresented overall in all decision points, particularly for Honolulu. Although the percentage of African-Americans was low, their percentage in the system in all decision points showed an overrepresentation as compared to their proportion in the general population.

### 4. Mixed Pacific Islander ethnic category

This ethnic grouping is worth a closer examination as the data consistently shows an overrepresentation in all phases across all years. This ethnic grouping doesn't provide relevant information on the specific Pacific Islander ethnic group who are experiencing difficulties within the juvenile justice system.

### 5. System Improvements

Maui, Kauai, and Hawaii rates of arrests, referrals, petitions, adjudications per 1000 youth were two to three times more than Honolulu, an issue that was also seen in the previous crime analysis report (2006 – 2008). In many instances, they surpass the state rates. This is worth a closer examination as the youth populations of these respective counties are less than Oahu.

Ethnic identification is also an issue to be aware of as a noticeable percentage of youth still was not given an ethnic identification in all phases. This is particularly noticeable with the Hawaii circuit data. This is a problem as per Family Court procedures; the referral requires a birth certificate to verify demographic information such as ethnicity.

### 6. Prevention

Given the body of literature that advocates for the deterrence of status offenders from further involvement in the juvenile justice system, prevention strategies or services at the arrest and referral decision points become vital. In addition, evaluation of these services is equally important as data would help program planners and funders determine the efficacy of such prevention services.

Similar to the crime analysis report of 2006 – 2008, the age groups of 16 to 17 were the largest at all decision points. In examining the data, age 14 seems to be the age when the numbers start showing a rapid incline. Thus, a recommendation is to target prevention services for youth below 14 as noted in the Honolulu circuit data, age 13 accounted for 11 – 12% of the age group in probation.

## 7. Gender

The least gender difference was reflected in the Honolulu circuit in the arrest, referral, and diversion decision points. However, in subsequent phases (petition, probation, adjudication, HYCF) gender difference increased rapidly. Diversion phase had the lowest gender difference for all decision points. Kauai fluctuated the most in the probation and adjudication phases. Gender difference for this circuit went from the lowest in 2009 to the highest in 2010 compared to other circuits.

**In addition to the above**, a discussion of several factors not presented in the data analysis segment is presented below.

### **Detention Reform**

While the primary purpose of secured juvenile detention is to hold juveniles awaiting trial to protect the public and the children themselves from harm, in practice, this may not always be the case. Not every minor arrested for an offense needs placement in a secured juvenile detention facility. Many just need a referral to a non-secure alternative. The harsh reality is throughout the country, secured detention is often unnecessarily or inappropriately used. Juveniles are often detained because of the lack of alternatives to detention, the lack of appropriate services, because service providers deny youth access due to behavioral problems or detention is used for punishment or as a consequence. Sometimes, officials have difficulty distinguishing between youth who present public safety risks and those who do not, and therefore we see unnecessary or inappropriate detentions. Hawaii is no exception.

Through the combined leadership of the Judiciary, the Office of Youth Services and the Juvenile Justice State Advisory Council's (JJSAC) the Annie E. Casey (AEC) Foundation selected Hawaii to be a Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) site. JDAI was launched in April 2008 when over 100 stakeholders from across the state participated in activities to familiarize communities with JDAI. The inaugural events were followed by a Fundamentals training and two juvenile justice system assessments. The JDAI Coordinator was hired in February 2009 with Formula Grant funding support, and a Detention Utilization Study was completed focusing on the conditions of confinement at the Detention Home Facility. The JDAI Executive Committee, the JDAI governance structure, was formed. AEC provides the state extensive training and technical assistance and an annual allocation of \$75,000 for three years.

Juvenile justice reform and improvement of juvenile detention policy and practice is in alignment with the JJSAC's support of systems reform, the mission of SAGs, and in meeting the core requirements of the JJDP Act. Detention reform has been a part of the state's Formula Grant Comprehensive 3-Year Plan with over \$500,000 invested in the hiring of the JDAI Coordinator and alternatives to detention programs and services. Recognizing that JDAI and the JJSAC's mission and plans are complementary, the JJSAC will continue to allocate Formula Grant funds for alternatives to detention programming and/or system improvements for three years including FY 2012 plans.

### **Loss of Police Diversion Programs on Oahu**

In 2007, the Honolulu Police Department informed juvenile justice agencies that by the end of the year, the Department would no longer administer HPD's juvenile diversion programs.

Resources were being redirected away from the administrative responsibilities for Akamai (for first time status offenders), Evening Counseling (for first time minor law violators and second time status offenders) and School Attendance Program (SAP) for first time truants. Through negotiations with HPD the deadline was moved to 2008.

With the closing of these diversion programs, an already overburdened court and prosecutor system could expect an estimated 2,100 evening counseling and 1,100 Akamai cases being referred to them. With 3,200 cases bombarding the system, it was clear that Oahu was facing a crisis. And these figures do not reflect the truancy figures for SAP. The Department of Education took the lead in addressing the truancy issue and the Office of Youth Services diversion for status offenders and minor law violators. With no funding available, a group of system and private non-profit folks rallied together to respond to the crisis. From this, emerged the Department of Defense and Family Court taking over Akamai in January 2008. Akamai was renamed KOA, Kokua Aloha Ohana. The City's Juvenile Justice Center and two private non-profits took over Evening Counseling in August 2008. Today, the KOA program continue to provide services with no additional funds but may not be able to continue too much longer without funding. The Juvenile Justice Center continues to receive JABG funds for the Evening Counseling segment. In addition, preliminary discussions are currently being made to enhance services that will include youth who are in need of services to avoid entry or further penetration into the juvenile justice system.

## **(2) List of State's Priority Juvenile Justice Needs/Problem Statements**

### **Priority 1. Compliance with DSO, JLR and SSS**

Compliance with the core requirements is imperative not only for the state to qualify for its Formula Grant and Title V allocation, but more importantly to protect youth from being appropriately held in secured detention and correctional facilities.

The number of juvenile arrests continues to place Hawaii at risk of not being in compliance with the core requirements of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act – Jail and Lockup Removal, Sight and Sound Separation, and Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders. Status offenses comprise a large percentage (nearly 50%) of juvenile arrests statewide as well as in each of the four counties. This large number increases the possibility of DSO violations which in turn affects sight and sound and jail removal violations as well.

Thanks to the Part Time Compliance Monitor position paid out of Formula Grant Program Area 6 funding allocation, the state is able to provide focused attention on compliance. As a result, it has positively affected the State's ability to achieve and maintain compliance with the three requirements of the JJDP Act since falling out of compliance in 1996. Maintaining compliance continues to be a challenge since compliance is vested with other agencies (police, sheriffs, family courts, HYCF, other secured facilities). In police lockups, the rotation policy of moving officers every so many years make education on the mandates a never-ending challenge and the confusion over when liquor laws should be considered a law violation under state statute and when they are considered a status offense for compliance purposes. The requirement to report these incidents have recently been changed that would not be counted for compliance purposes

pending review or consideration by OJJDP. The reporting of these incidents are made separately and not included as DSO violations.

Providing access to alternatives to secure custody has had a positive impact on the State's ability to keep juveniles out of inappropriate secure custody and thus a greater likelihood of maintaining compliance with DSO, jail removal and sight and sound separation. Access to these services has also afforded juveniles and their family immediate intervention and linkages to services.

### **Priority 2. Overrepresentation in the Juvenile Justice System**

Hawaii's multi-ethnic populations make it especially important to ensure they every youth in the juvenile justice system is treated fairly and equitably regardless of race/ethnicity and gender orientation.

A major study of DMC in Hawaii examining disparities at all major decision points was conducted in 1995 by Kassebaum (1995). He and his colleagues found that "the differences by ethnicity through the system are not large but for some, particularly Hawaiians, they are consistent" (Kassebaum et al., 1995; pg. 2.8). Native Hawaiians were found to be at slight disadvantage at each decision point in the system, receiving a more severe intervention by the court for each stage. Law violation cases and status offense cases both reflected this tendency toward more sever outcomes for Hawaiian youth. The Study also found that East Asians (including Chinese, Japanese, Korean) and white youth are significantly more likely to receive milder outcomes of counsel and release even when the severity of the offense and prior court records are accounted for. A continuation study based on focus group data resulted in themes pointing to causes of overrepresentation. These focused on the underlying reasons that youths get into trouble, such as child abuse and neglect, drug use, economic hardship, depression, social marginalization, distress and dysfunction within families, and, specifically for Native Hawaiians, political disenfranchisement and the erosion of strong family authority after colonization.

The DMC Study conducted by the University of Hawaii at Manoa, Department of Urban and Regional Planning (March 2012) finds similar patterns to Kassebaum's study completed over 15 years ago. Statewide, an analysis of the decision points for youth juvenile offenses suggests that Hawaiians, Samoans, other Pacific Islanders, and mixed-race youth fare worse that Caucasians at the stages of arrest, referral, petition, detention, and adjudication, with the greatest degree of disparity at the point of arrest. City and County of Honolulu, the largest local jurisdiction, displays the greatest disparity for Native Hawaiians, Samoans and other Pacific Islanders. Once arrested, there is a consistent and cumulative pattern of disproportionate contact, especially for Native Hawaiian, Mixed Race and Other Pacific Islander youths. The cumulative disadvantage persists although the magnitude lessens as youth penetrate deeper into the system. Even if these groups fare better toward the later stages of case processing, the high degree of disproportionality that occurs at the first stage of arrest is not ameliorated by any favorable outcome at the later stage of sentencing. Native Hawaiians are clearly the most overrepresented group relative to their proportion of the youth population and face disproportionately negative outcomes at the greatest number of decision points compared to other ethnic groups.

Funds will be allocated to impact DMC at various points in the juvenile justice system and in specific jurisdictions where disproportionality exists. Compliance with DMC also contributes directly to the State's eligibility to receive its funding allocation

### **Priority 3. Status Offenders**

Hawaii has a huge problem with status offenders. Data from the crime analysis shows the magnitude of the problem at especially arrest and referral. Status offenders are even being placed in correctional facilities according to the data (violation of Probation, etc). Diversion resources for status offenders and minor law violators to divert them away from system involvement are few and funding is extremely limited. Oahu recently faced a crisis with the pending closure of police diversion services. Through the efforts of many individuals these programs have continued but without any funding. They are at great risk of ending because no on-going funding is available to continue these services and to prevent more than 3,000 cases from entering an already overburdened juvenile justice system.

The juvenile justice system is overburdened with status offenders. Almost half of the youth being processed at the various points in the juvenile justice system are status offenders. The figures presented in the crime analysis do not even reflect the full picture when it comes to the problem of status offenders. Additional data on educational neglect petitions and truancy are not reflected in the crime analysis.

Police, Family Court, and Detention data as well as discussions with juvenile justice professionals indicate that status offenders continue to be a major problem in our communities. The crime analysis data by the University of Hawaii, Myron B. Thompson School of Social Work consistently showed status offenses as the highest type of offense for arrests, referrals, diversions, petitions, adjudications, and probation. Arrest data reflect that statewide, status offenses accounted for approximately 50% of all juvenile arrests for the three year period 2009-2011; 52.0% in 2009, 50.1% in 2010 and 48.2% in 2011 (Jan – Sept 2011). In 2009, Honolulu and Kauai, status offenses comprised more than 50% of all juvenile arrests; in 2010, Honolulu status offenses comprised more than 50% of all juvenile arrest; and in 2011, Honolulu status offenses comprised 49.6% of all juvenile arrests.

The referral rates of Maui, Hawaii, and Kauai circuits were over twice that of the referral rates for Honolulu across the three years (2009, 2010, and 2011). All four circuits showed that the largest percentage of their referrals were from status offenses with Honolulu showing the highest percentage. It accounted for 40% or more of the referrals for each year, for each circuit. Statewide referral data also reflect that status offenses accounted for the largest percentage of referrals to Family Court for the three year period; 52.5% in 2009, 50.7% in 2010 and 56.6% in 2011, a trend that is also reflected in county data. This warrants further examination and analysis because these numbers reflect cases and not unduplicated counts.

Detention rates were the highest in 2009 (1,074) of 8.1 per 1000 youth. It declined to a rate of 6.3 (844) in 2010. For part of 2011, the rate decreased about half of 2009 (N=517, rate of 3.9 per 1000 youth). This is attributed to the JDAI efforts in its focus on alternatives to detention, and

the elimination of Hawaii's Valid Court Order in mid 2010 where detention no longer processes status offenders.

Overall, there certainly is a need to assess what is happening in our fragmented and resource limited response to the problem of status offenders and their families. Processing a juvenile through the system, especially at arrest, does not appear to be the most appropriate response. Earlier intervention appears to provide juveniles and their families a better chance of resolving issues and preventing or minimizing their penetration further into the system.

#### **Priority 4. Probation**

Programs to permit juvenile offenders to remain in their communities under conditions that the juvenile court prescribes is a priority that Hawaii is moving forward in order to assist juvenile probation clients make good decisions and avoid entry or further penetration to secure detention or correctional facilities. A goal is to provide intensive supervision for youth, hold them accountable for their behavior and assist youth to be in compliance with the terms and conditions of probation. The service delivery approach must include the youth's family in supporting the youth's participation in activities that increase protective factors and decrease risk factors in various domains of the youth's life. Program funds will be utilized to support community-based organizations to work with respective probation officers as the main referral source of youth offenders on probation. Service components are to be provided in a manner that addresses the differing ethnic, racial and gender-specific need of youth. The intent of intensive monitoring of probation youth offenders is to decrease the probability of incarceration where the majority of commitments to HYCF are based on violations of probation.

#### **Priority 5. Alternatives to Detention**

While the primary purpose of secure juvenile detention is to hold juveniles awaiting trial to protect the public and the children themselves from harm, in practice, this is not always the case. Not every minor arrested for an offense needs placement in a secure juvenile detention facility. Many are more suited for referral to non-secure alternatives. The harsh reality throughout the country is that secure detention is often unnecessarily or inappropriately used. Juveniles are often detained because of the lack of alternatives to detention, the lack of appropriate services or because service providers deny youth access due to behavioral problems. Sometimes, officials have difficulty distinguishing between youth who present public safety risks and those who do not, and therefore we see unnecessary or inappropriate detentions. This also applies well with youth offenders committed to the Hawaii Youth Correctional Facility (secure confinement). As Formula Grant Program Area 2 defines alternatives to detention to be "alternative services provided to a juvenile offender in the community as an alternative to confinement," this in itself, establishes the paradigm shift needed to realize the fact that incarceration is ineffective and does not reduce recidivism.

Hawaii is no exception. Realizing this, the SAG embarked on a course towards detention reform as indicated in previous state plans and funds were allocated to convene stakeholders, for a JDAI Coordinator and alternatives to detention. Juvenile justice reform and improvement of juvenile detention policy and practice is in alignment with the SAGs support of systems reform, the mission of SAGs, and in meeting the core requirements of the JJDP Act.

Detention reform has been a part of the state's three year plan for 2009 – 2011. With the exception of the JDAI Coordinator, the JJSAC will continue to fund alternatives to detention programming for the next three-year (2012 – 2014) plan including FY 2012 plans. This will also include alternatives to secure confinement (HYCF short-term and/or long-term placement).

**Priority 6. Community Assessment Center(s)**

Hawaii recognizes the fact that more effective and efficient methods of intervention with youth at risk of becoming delinquent need to be developed and established. There is recognition not only that the juvenile justice system could better serve youth and families, but also that the system has many inefficiencies. Finding a solution to these systemic problems is difficult and complicated because violence and delinquency are often the result of more than one risk factor.

OJJDP's Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency has demonstrated that delinquent youth often face multiple risk factors and that as risk factors accumulate, higher levels of delinquency and other problem behaviors result (Browning and Loeber, 1999). Consequently, youth with these problems are often involved in several different systems (e.g., juvenile justice, mental health, alcohol, and other drug treatment) that may not adequately communicate with one another. The Community Assessment Center concept, addresses these problems by bringing together fragmented service delivery systems in a collaborative, timely, cost-efficient, and comprehensive manner.

The key elements that have the potential to positively impact the lives of youth and divert them from the path of serious, violent, and chronic delinquency includes a Single Point of Entry, Immediate and Complete Assessments, Management Information System, and Integrated Case Management. The goals may include reduced law enforcement time devoted to juveniles; central receiving facility; immediate access to treatment; pool resources from different agencies, etc.

Funding support with Formula Grant funds will be made that includes FY 2012 plans.

**Priority 7. Prevention**

Feedback from all segments of the juvenile justice system points to the need to address problems and risk factors that contribute toward delinquent behaviors early on. Research has demonstrated that community driven prevention and early intervention programs that strengthen protective factors and focus on delinquency risk factors, can have a positive impact on curbing involvement with the juvenile justice system, lowering teen pregnancy rates, improving school attendance, and decreasing the numbers of alienated and dropouts from school.

The recently completed Crime Analysis recommended that prevention strategies or services at the arrest and referral decision points of the juvenile justice system are vital and evaluation of these services are equally important for program planning and to determine the efficacy of such prevention services. A second recommendation is to target prevention services for youth below 14 in high risk areas since the age group 16-17 were the largest at all decision points.

**Priority 8. Girls in the Juvenile Justice System**

Females continue to be served inadequately. Girls, especially those involved with the juvenile justice system, continue to lack proper programming. Programs and services for juvenile delinquents were historically developed for male adolescents. These traditional models fail to address the developmental needs of female adolescents and contemporary issues of girls/women roles in society. Programs and services for young female offenders and girls at-risk needs to be provided on a level equitable to that which is offered to young male offenders and boys-at-risk. Such changes would be similar to the changes being instituted in school sports programs as a result of Title IX.

In 1998, girls accounted for nearly 40% of all juvenile arrests in the State and 35% of all juvenile detentions. While girls at the HYCF account for only 10% of the commitments, they are committed for crimes that are far less serious than their female counterparts on the mainland. Judges, police and probation staff are concerned about the needs of pregnant females in the system and girls on the streets who are being sexually exploited. Between 1994 and 1996, the number of arrests for robbery doubled, most of which was attributed to girls. Girls comprise the greater proportion of status offenses, in particular, runaways as well as minor law violations.

With funds provided by the Office of Youth Services, the First Judicial Circuit developed a Girls Court which serves as a catalyst and a vehicle to develop effective programming to meet the gender specific needs of girls. The Girls Court focuses on building strengths, increasing skills, and developing resiliency, while stressing accountability and reducing recidivism. In addition, the Girls Court collaborates with other agencies in developing a continuum of programs and services to ensure that the multiple service needs of the in the juvenile justice system are appropriately addressed.

The State opened a model program for girls, Safe House, as an alternative to incarceration for court ordered females who are in need of a residential placement more structured than a tradition group home but less severe than incarceration at the HYCF. The Safe House currently has bed space for six to eight females. Services are provided to support and assist females in increasing their resiliency and reducing their risk factors so that they are able to safely return to a more permanent living situation.

**Priority 9. Substance Abuse and Mental Health**

Juveniles in the system have significant mental health and substance abuse issues that are not being adequately addressed due to the lack of mental health and substance abuse treatment programs, inadequate staffing capacity, and the lack of a comprehensive continuum of care. The August 2005 DOJ report offers a more glaring observation of the lack or inadequate access to mental health services. While the HYCF contracts with outside providers for medical and mental health services, poor communication between professional staff, including the mental health staff, and social workers, is a barrier to proper care at HYCF. Additionally, the Youth Correctional Officers' complete control over communication between the facility's youth residents and its professional staff is an even greater impediment to the delivery of adequate care.



Data from a 2001 (S. Peter Kim, M. D., et al) study on the mental health of youth at HYCF revealed that mental health disorders were prevalent for nearly all youth who had a psychiatric evaluation—with conduct disorder and substance abuse/dependency being the most prominent concern.. According to staff observation, 80 to90% of the youth are dual diagnosed and have both mental health and drug issues.

In that same report, nearly all of the youth had a history of substance abuse. The most commonly used substance was marijuana, followed by alcohol and cigarettes. Over half the youths used methamphetamine. The earliest average start of substance use was with cigarettes at 11 -12 years old; the latest use of substances involved methamphetamine at 14 years old.

**Table 1-1a Arrest rates by type of offense and circuit for 2009 (duplicated)**

	State	Honolulu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Total arrests</b>	15293 (100%)	6875 (100%)	4247 (100%)	1962 (100%)	1570 (100%)
<b>Arrest rate</b>	114.9	75.2	267.0	103.5	232.1
<b>Type of Offense</b>					
Drug	1244 (8.1%)	322 (4.7%)	476 (11.2%)	301 (15.3%)	112 (7.1%)
Person	1109 (7.3%)	549 (8.0%)	228 (5.4%)	108 (5.4%)	148 (9.4%)
Property	2810 (18.4%)	1308 (19.0%)	633 (14.9%)	402 (20.5%)	304 (19.4%)
Sex	141 (0.9%)	97 (1.4%)	15 (0.4%)	8 (0.4%)	11 (0.7%)
Status	7957 (52.0%)	3933 (57.2%)	1961 (46.2%)	913 (46.5%)	861 (54.8%)
Person NC	671 (4.4%)	274 (4.0%)	252 (5.9%)	39 (2.0%)	68 (4.3%)
Other	1361 (8.9%)	392 (5.7%)	682 (16.1%)	183 (9.8%)	66 (4.2%)

**Table 1-2a Arrest rates by type of offense and circuit for 2010 (duplicated)**

	State	Honolulu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Total arrests</b>	13448 (100%)	6676 (100%)	3094 (100%)	1970 (100%)	1141 (100%)
<b>Arrest rate</b>	101.1	73.7	194.5	103.9	168.7
<b>Type of Offense</b>					
Drug	1204 (9.0%)	340 (5.1%)	442 (14.3%)	275 (14.0%)	126 (11.0%)
Person	1137 (8.5%)	655 (9.8%)	139 (4.5%)	129 (6.5%)	146 (12.8%)
Property	2465 (18.3%)	1344 (20.1%)	403 (13.0%)	399 (20.3%)	203 (17.8%)
Sex	133 (1.0%)	81 (1.2%)	17 (0.5%)	11 (0.6%)	13 (1.1%)
Status	6737 (50.1%)	3639 (54.5%)	1375 (44.4%)	937 (47.6%)	478 (41.9%)
Person NC	653 (4.9%)	279 (4.2%)	204 (6.6%)	54 (2.7%)	90 (7.9%)
Other	1119 (8.3%)	338 (5.1%)	514 (16.6%)	165 (8.4%)	85 (7.4%)

**Table 1-3a Arrest rates by type of offense and circuit for 2011 (duplicated)**

	State	Honolulu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Total arrests<sup>5</sup></b>	7391(100%)	3969 (100%)	1110 (100%)	1093 (100%)	871 (100%)
<b>Arrest rates</b>	55.6	43.7	69.8	57.7	128.8
<b>Type of Offense</b>					
Drug	575 (7.8%)	209 (5.3%)	102 (9.2%)	147 (13.4%)	104 (11.9%)
Person	699 (9.5%)	401 (10.1%)	71 (6.4%)	81 (7.5%)	100 (11.5%)
Property	1476 (20.0%)	910 (22.9%)	161 (14.5%)	192 (17.6%)	149 (17.1%)
Sex	101 (1.4%)	72 (1.8%)	1 (0.1%)	3 (0.3%)	5 (0.6%)
Status	3560 (48.2%)	1968 (49.6%)	496 (44.7%)	511 (46.8%)	408 (46.8%)
Person NC	350 (4.7%)	165 (4.2%)	75 (6.8%)	38 (3.5%)	54 (6.2%)
Other	628 (8.5%)	244 (6.1%)	204 (18.4%)	121 (11.1%)	49 (5.6%)

<sup>5</sup> Total occurrence/ arrest rates for 2011 was only for the period from January 2011-September 2011.

Table 1-1b Arrest rates by gender, age, ethnicity, and circuit for 2009 (unduplicated)

	State	Honolulu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Gender</b>					
Male	3869 (61.1%)	1842 (59.7%)	1017 (62.1%)	519 (82.3%)	290 (63.3%)
Female	2465 (38.9%)	1242 (40.3%)	622 (37.9%)	314 (37.7%)	168 (36.7%)
Total	6334 (100%)	3084 (100%)	1639 (100%)	833 (100%)	458 (100%)
<b>Age</b>					
10	65 (1.0%)	19 (0.6%)	34 (2.1%)	5 (0.6%)	2 (0.4%)
11	232 (3.7%)	77 (2.5%)	98 (6.0%)	19 (2.3%)	22 (4.8%)
12	436 (6.9%)	170 (5.5%)	156 (9.5%)	43 (5.2%)	31 (6.8%)
13	799 (12.6%)	347 (11.3%)	212 (12.9%)	82 (9.8%)	51 (11.1%)
14	1257 (19.8%)	711 (23.1%)	258 (15.7%)	126 (15.1%)	110 (24.0%)
15	1646 (26.0%)	911 (29.5%)	374 (22.8%)	206 (24.7%)	102 (22.3%)
16	1038 (16.4%)	498 (16.1%)	282 (17.2%)	157 (18.8%)	71 (15.5%)
17	861 (13.6%)	351 (11.4%)	225 (13.7%)	195 (23.4%)	69 (15.1%)
Total	6334 (100%)	3084 (100%)	1639 (100%)	833 (100%)	458 (100%)
<b>Ethnicity</b>					
Caucasian	1381 (21.8%)	476 (15.2%)	504 (30.8%)	240 (28.8%)	130 (28.4%)
Hawaiian	1925 (30.4%)	888 (28.8%)	494 (30.1%)	293 (35.2%)	152 (33.2%)
African American	184 (2.9%)	129 (4.2%)	14 (0.9%)	23 (2.8%)	6 (1.3%)
Chinese	73 (1.2%)	54 (1.8%)	7 (0.4%)	5 (0.6%)	3 (0.7%)
Filipino	1239 (19.6%)	620 (20.1%)	347 (21.2%)	94 (11.3%)	108 (23.6%)
Japanese	325 (5.1%)	171 (5.5%)	75 (4.6%)	32 (3.8%)	32 (7.0%)
Korean	55 (0.9%)	41 (1.3%)	5 (0.3%)	4 (0.5%)	0 (0%)
Latino/ Hispanic	183 (2.9%)	80 (2.6%)	60 (3.7%)	31 (3.7%)	6 (1.3%)
Native American	9 (0.1%)	4 (0.1%)	0 (0%)	5 (0.6%)	0 (0%)
Other Asian/ Mixed					
Asian	79 (1.2%)	75 (2.4%)	2 (0.1%)	1 (0.1%)	0 (0%)
Other Pacific					
Islander/ Mixed					
Pacific Islander	416 (6.6%)	286 (9.3%)	56 (3.4%)	24 (2.9%)	12 (2.6%)
Samoaan	287 (4.5%)	245 (7.9%)	7 (0.4%)	9 (1.1%)	1 (0.2%)
Other	131 (2.1%)	0 (0%)	68 (4.1%)	59 (7.1%)	4 (0.9%)
Unknown	44 (0.7%)	22 (0.7%)	0 (0%)	12 (1.4%)	4 (0.9%)
Total	6331 (100%)	3082 (100%)	1639 (100%)	832 (100%)	458 (100%)

Table 1-2b Arrest rates by gender, age, ethnicity, and circuit for 2010 (unduplicated)

	State	Honolulu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Gender</b>					
Male	2583 (58.3%)	1321 (56.7%)	620 (62.4%)	352 (57.6%)	184 (62.8%)
Female	1849 (41.7%)	1009 (43.3%)	373 (37.6%)	259 (42.4%)	109 (37.2%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>4432 (100%)</b>	<b>2330 (100%)</b>	<b>993 (100%)</b>	<b>611 (100%)</b>	<b>293 (100%)</b>
<b>Age</b>					
10	58 (1.3%)	15 (0.6%)	31 (3.1%)	8 (1.3%)	2 (0.7%)
11	169 (3.8%)	43 (1.8%)	77 (7.7%)	17 (2.8%)	14 (4.8%)
12	303 (6.8%)	115 (4.9%)	108 (10.9%)	33 (5.4%)	22 (7.5%)
13	545 (12.3%)	237 (10.2%)	135 (13.6%)	76 (12.4%)	31 (10.6%)
14	832 (18.8%)	487 (20.0%)	175 (17.6%)	104 (17.0%)	48 (15.7%)
15	935 (21.1%)	573 (24.6%)	184 (18.5%)	121 (19.8%)	53 (18.1%)
16	988 (22.3%)	573 (24.6%)	194 (19.5%)	132 (21.6%)	72 (24.6%)
17	603 (13.6%)	307 (13.2%)	110 (11.1%)	120 (19.8%)	53 (18.1%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>4433 (100%)</b>	<b>2330 (100%)</b>	<b>994 (100%)</b>	<b>611 (100%)</b>	<b>293 (100%)</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>					
Caucasian	1003 (22.6%)	381 (16.4%)	293 (29.5%)	181 (29.3%)	118 (40.3%)
Hawaiian	1223 (27.6%)	639 (27.4%)	277 (27.9%)	183 (30.0%)	75 (25.6%)
African American	118 (2.7%)	89 (3.8%)	9 (0.9%)	8 (1.3%)	3 (1.0%)
Chinese	61 (1.4%)	48 (2.1%)	3 (0.3%)	5 (0.8%)	1 (0.3%)
Filipino	908 (20.5%)	500 (21.5%)	250 (25.2%)	68 (11.1%)	53 (18.1%)
Japanese	232 (5.2%)	140 (6.0%)	33 (3.3%)	33 (5.4%)	17 (5.8%)
Korean	40 (0.9%)	34 (1.5%)	3 (0.3%)	1 (0.2%)	0 (0%)
Latino/ Hispanic	127 (2.9%)	69 (3.0%)	25 (2.5%)	24 (3.9%)	7 (2.4%)
Native American	6 (0.1%)	2 (0.1%)	0 (0%)	3 (0.5%)	1 (0.3%)
Other Asian/ Mixed					
Asian	55 (1.2%)	45 (1.9%)	1 (0.1%)	2 (0.3%)	1 (0.3%)
Other Pacific					
Islander/ Mixed					
Pacific Islander	311 (7.0%)	193 (8.3%)	49 (4.9%)	23 (3.8%)	6 (2.0%)
Samoaan	184 (4.2%)	161 (6.9%)	3 (0.3%)	8 (1.3%)	2 (0.7%)
Other	109 (2.5%)	0 (0%)	48 (4.8%)	54 (8.8%)	7 (2.4%)
Unknown	54 (1.2%)	27 (1.2%)	0 (0%)	18 (2.9%)	2 (0.7%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>4431 (100%)</b>	<b>2328 (100%)</b>	<b>994 (100%)</b>	<b>611 (100%)</b>	<b>293 (100%)</b>

Table 1-3b Arrest rates by gender, age, ethnicity and circuit for 2011 (unduplicated)

	State	Honolulu	Maul	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Gender</b>					
Male	1344 (58.1%)	740 (57.8%)	215 (59.4%)	204 (57.6%)	108 (56.5%)
Female	969 (41.9%)	541 (42.2%)	147 (40.6%)	150 (42.4%)	83 (43.5%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>2313 (100%)</b>	<b>1281 (100%)</b>	<b>382 (100%)</b>	<b>354 (100%)</b>	<b>191 (100%)</b>
<b>Age</b>					
10	30 (1.3%)	16 (1.2%)	8 (2.2%)	0 (0%)	3 (1.6%)
11	75 (3.2%)	26 (2.0%)	26 (7.2%)	12 (3.4%)	7 (3.7%)
12	165 (7.1%)	72 (5.6%)	28 (7.7%)	21 (5.9%)	24 (12.6%)
13	266 (11.5%)	124 (9.7%)	42 (11.6%)	40 (11.3%)	26 (13.6%)
14	421 (18.2%)	243 (19.0%)	61 (16.9%)	62 (17.5%)	25 (13.1%)
15	447 (19.3%)	271 (21.2%)	75 (20.7%)	68 (19.2%)	26 (13.6%)
16	480 (20.8%)	291 (22.7%)	61 (16.9%)	81 (22.9%)	30 (15.7%)
17	429 (18.5%)	238 (18.6%)	61 (16.9%)	70 (19.8%)	50 (26.2%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>2313 (100%)</b>	<b>1281 (100%)</b>	<b>382 (100%)</b>	<b>354 (100%)</b>	<b>191 (100%)</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>					
Caucasian	528 (22.8%)	216 (16.9%)	121 (33.4%)	102 (28.8%)	68 (34.7%)
Hawaiian	624 (27.0%)	353 (27.6%)	101 (27.9%)	91 (25.7%)	42 (22.1%)
African American	70 (3.0%)	51 (4.0%)	7 (1.9%)	8 (2.3%)	3 (1.6%)
Chinese	44 (1.9%)	36 (2.8%)	2 (0.6%)	1 (0.3%)	0 (0%)
Filipino	441 (19.1%)	283 (20.5%)	67 (18.5%)	46 (13.0%)	49 (25.8%)
Japanese	112 (4.8%)	58 (4.5%)	17 (4.7%)	18 (5.1%)	13 (6.8%)
Korean	23 (1.0%)	20 (1.6%)	1 (0.3%)	1 (0.3%)	0 (0%)
Latino/ Hispanic	60 (2.6%)	32 (2.5%)	10 (2.8%)	10 (2.8%)	5 (2.6%)
Native American	7 (0.3%)	5 (0.4%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.6%)	0 (0%)
Other Asian/ Mixed					
Asian	26 (1.1%)	24 (1.9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.5%)
Other Pacific					
Islander/ Mixed					
Pacific Islander	139 (6.0%)	99 (7.7%)	10 (2.8%)	14 (4.0%)	3 (1.6%)
Samoan	129 (5.6%)	107 (8.4%)	1 (0.3%)	3 (0.8%)	2 (1.1%)
Other	46 (2.0%)	1 (0.1%)	25 (6.9%)	20 (5.6%)	0 (0%)
Unknown	62 (2.7%)	15 (1.2%)	0 (0%)	38 (10.7%)	6 (3.2%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>2311 (100%)</b>	<b>1280 (100%)</b>	<b>382 (100%)</b>	<b>354 (100%)</b>	<b>190 (100%)</b>

Table 2-1a Referral rates by type of offense and circuit for 2009 (duplicated)

	State	Honolulu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Total referrals</b>	10837 (100%)	4824 (100%)	2438 (100%)	2089 (100%)	1508 (100%)
<b>Referral rates*</b>	81.5	52.8	153.1	108.1	223.0
<b>Type of Offense*</b>					
Drug	721 (6.7%)	104 (2.2%)	274 (11.2%)	243 (11.7%)	100 (6.6%)
Person	759 (7.0%)	319 (6.6%)	139 (5.7%)	173 (8.4%)	128 (8.5%)
Property	1798 (16.6%)	568 (11.8%)	496 (20.4%)	421 (20.3%)	313 (20.8%)
Sex	75 (0.7%)	54 (1.1%)	3 (0.1%)	12 (0.6%)	6 (0.4%)
Status	5687 (52.5%)	2932 (60.8%)	1084 (44.5%)	953 (46.1%)	718 (47.6%)
Person NC	329 (3.0%)	80 (1.7%)	90 (3.7%)	87 (4.2%)	72 (4.8%)
Other	1429 (13.2%)	756 (15.7%)	340 (14.0%)	171 (8.3%)	162 (10.7%)

Table 2-2a Referral rates by type of offense and circuit for 2010 (duplicated)

	State	Honolulu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Total referrals</b>	8755 (100%)	4150 (100%)	1717 (100%)	2150 (100%)	738 (100%)
<b>Referral rates*</b>	65.8	45.4	107.9	113.4	109.1
<b>Type of Offense*</b>					
Drug	661 (7.5%)	110 (2.7%)	244 (14.2%)	256 (11.9%)	51 (6.9%)
Person	645 (7.4%)	339 (8.2%)	40 (2.3%)	186 (8.7%)	80 (10.8%)
Property	1512 (7.3%)	594 (14.3%)	379 (22.1%)	385 (17.9%)	154 (20.9%)
Sex	99 (1.1%)	70 (1.7%)	1 (0.1%)	16 (0.7%)	12 (1.6%)
Status	4443 (50.7%)	2384 (57.4%)	730 (42.5%)	1017 (47.3%)	312 (42.3%)
Person NC	286 (3.3%)	95 (2.3%)	48 (2.8%)	101 (4.7%)	42 (5.7%)
Other	1071 (12.2%)	542 (13.1%)	265 (15.4%)	178 (8.3%)	86 (11.7%)

Table 2-3a Referrals rates by type of offense and circuit for 2011 (duplicated)

	State	Honolulu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Total referrals</b>	4075 (100%)	2356 (100%)	413 (100%)	805 (100%)	501 (100%)
<b>Referral rates*</b>	30.6	25.8	26.0	42.5	74.0
<b>Type of Offense*</b>					
Drug	192 (4.7%)	26 (1.1%)	37 (9.0%)	89 (11.1%)	40 (8.0%)
Person	323 (7.9%)	210 (8.9%)	17 (4.1%)	48 (6.0%)	48 (9.6%)
Property	541 (13.3%)	190 (8.1%)	91 (22.0%)	155 (19.3%)	105 (21.0%)
Sex	72 (1.8%)	61 (2.6%)	1 (0.2%)	4 (0.5%)	6 (1.2%)
Status	2308 (56.6%)	1536 (65.2%)	184 (44.6%)	389 (48.3%)	199 (39.7%)
Person NC	129 (3.2%)	39 (1.7%)	14 (3.4%)	34 (4.2%)	42 (8.4%)
Other	499 (12.2%)	293 (12.4%)	61 (14.8%)	84 (10.4%)	61 (12.2%)

\* General population information on youth ages between 10 and 17 were taken from census 2010 to calculate referral rates.

\* The sum of the seven charges may not add up to the total due to missing data.

Table 2-1b Referral rates by gender, age, ethnicity, and circuit for 2009 (unduplicated)

	State	Honolulu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Gender</b>					
Male	1739 (59.3%)	703 (56.6%)	361(60.2%)	487 (61.3%)	188 (63.5%)
Female	1192 (40.7%)	538 (43.4%)	239 (39.8%)	307 (38.7%)	108 (36.5%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>2931 (100%)</b>	<b>1241 (100%)</b>	<b>600 (100%)</b>	<b>794 (100%)</b>	<b>296 (100%)</b>
<b>Age</b>					
10	169 (0.7%)	8 (0.6%)	6 (1.0%)	7 (0.9%)	1 (0.3%)
11	22 (2.5%)	23 (1.8%)	17 (2.8%)	27 (3.4%)	6 (2.0%)
12	73 (4.4%)	47 (3.8%)	34 (5.7%)	34 (4.3%)	13 (4.4%)
13	128 (9.0%)	126 (10.1%)	49 (8.2%)	66 (8.3%)	24 (8.1%)
14	488 (16.6%)	251 (20.1%)	92 (15.3%)	98 (12.3%)	47 (15.9%)
15	693 (23.6%)	331 (26.5%)	110 (18.3%)	188 (23.7%)	64 (21.6%)
16	557 (19.0%)	218 (17.5%)	126 (21.0%)	158 (19.9%)	55 (18.6%)
17	712 (24.2%)	244 (19.6%)	166 (27.7%)	216 (27.2%)	86 (29.1%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>2938 (100%)</b>	<b>1248 (100%)</b>	<b>600 (100%)</b>	<b>794 (100%)</b>	<b>296 (100%)</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>					
Caucasian	669 (23.2%)	215 (17.5%)	180 (30.3%)	197 (25.5%)	77 (26.5%)
Hawaiian	905 (31.3%)	269 (30.0%)	192 (32.3%)	251 (32.5%)	93 (32.0%)
African American	68 (2.4%)	46 (3.7%)	6 (1.0%)	14 (1.8%)	2 (0.7%)
Chinese	28 (0.9%)	18 (1.5%)	3 (0.5%)	4 (0.5%)	1 (0.3%)
Filipino	519 (18.0%)	246(20.0%)	119 (20.0%)	91 (11.8%)	63 (21.6%)
Japanese	140 (4.8%)	75 (6.1%)	28 (4.7%)	22 (2.8%)	15 (5.2%)
Korean	20 (0.7%)	13 (1.1%)	2 (0.3%)	5 (0.6%)	0 (0%)
Latino/ Hispanic	83 (2.9%)	30 (2.4%)	20 (3.4%)	29 (3.8%)	4 (1.4%)
Native American	7 (0.2%)	2 (0.2%)	0 (0%)	5 (0.6%)	0 (0%)
Other Asian/ Mixed					
Asian	25 (0.9%)	23 (1.9%)	1 (0.2%)	1 (0.1%)	0 (0%)
Other Pacific					
Islander/ Mixed	122 (4.2%)	83 (6.7%)	17 (2.9%)	18 (2.3%)	4 (1.4%)
Pacific Islander					
Samoan	91 (3.2%)	84 (6.8%)	0 (0%)	7 (0.9%)	0 (0%)
Other	45 (1.6%)	0 (0%)	14 (2.4%)	30 (3.9%)	1 (0.3%)
Unknown	168 (5.8%)	26 (2.1%)	12 (2.0%)	99 (12.8%)	31 (10.7%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>2888 (100%)</b>	<b>1230 (100%)</b>	<b>594 (100%)</b>	<b>773 (100%)</b>	<b>291 (100%)</b>

Table 2-2b Referral rates by gender, age, ethnicity, and circuit for 2010 (unduplicated)

	State	Honolulu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Gender</b>					
Male	1752 (58.8%)	760 (55.3%)	336 (61.5%)	517 (61.4%)	139 (63.8%)
Female	1229 (41.2%)	615 (44.7%)	210 (38.5%)	325 (38.8%)	79 (36.2%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>2981 (100%)</b>	<b>1375 (100%)</b>	<b>546 (100%)</b>	<b>842 (100%)</b>	<b>218 (100%)</b>
<b>Age</b>					
10	27 (0.9%)	9 (0.7%)	1 (0.2%)	15 (1.8%)	2 (0.9%)
11	58 (1.9%)	12 (0.9%)	14 (2.6%)	28 (3.3%)	4 (1.8%)
12	118 (3.9%)	49 (3.5%)	21 (3.8%)	44 (5.2%)	4 (1.8%)
13	249 (8.3%)	115 (8.3%)	32 (5.9%)	86 (10.2%)	16 (7.3%)
14	444 (14.9%)	213 (15.4%)	78 (14.3%)	126 (14.9%)	27 (12.4%)
15	652 (21.8%)	332 (24.0%)	116 (21.2%)	165 (19.6%)	39 (17.9%)
16	796 (26.6%)	390 (28.2%)	135 (24.7%)	206 (24.4%)	65 (29.8%)
17	645 (21.6%)	262 (19.0%)	149 (27.3%)	173 (20.5%)	61 (28.0%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>2989 (100%)</b>	<b>1382 (100%)</b>	<b>546 (100%)</b>	<b>843 (100%)</b>	<b>218 (100%)</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>					
Caucasian	654 (22.1%)	218 (15.9%)	152 (27.9%)	214 (25.8%)	70 (32.1%)
Hawaiian	865 (29.2%)	411 (30.0%)	180 (29.4%)	239 (28.8%)	55 (25.2%)
African American	81 (2.7%)	61 (4.4%)	4 (0.7%)	12 (1.4%)	4 (1.8%)
Chinese	34 (1.1%)	18 (1.3%)	4 (0.7%)	10 (1.2%)	2 (0.9%)
Filipino	490 (16.5%)	260 (19.0%)	127 (23.3%)	67 (8.1%)	36 (16.5%)
Japanese	149 (5.0%)	85 (6.2%)	18 (3.3%)	36 (4.3%)	10 (4.6%)
Korean	26 (0.9%)	22 (1.6%)	3 (0.6%)	1 (0.1%)	0 (0%)
Latino/ Hispanic	75 (2.5%)	28 (2.0%)	21 (3.9%)	24 (2.9%)	2 (0.9%)
Native American	7 (0.2%)	3 (0.2%)	1 (0.2%)	3 (0.4%)	0 (0%)
Other Asian/ Mixed					
Asian	29 (1.0%)	27 (2.0%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.2%)	0 (0%)
Other Pacific					
Islander/ Mixed					
Pacific Islander	174 (5.9%)	121 (8.8%)	19 (3.5%)	26 (3.1%)	8 (3.7%)
Samoaan	104 (3.5%)	91 (6.6%)	4 (0.7%)	7 (0.8%)	2 (0.9%)
Other	47 (1.6%)	0 (0%)	14 (2.6%)	30 (3.6%)	3 (1.4%)
Unknown	228 (7.7%)	27 (2.0%)	17 (3.1%)	158 (19.2%)	26 (11.9%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>2963 (100%)</b>	<b>1372 (100%)</b>	<b>544 (100%)</b>	<b>829 (100%)</b>	<b>218 (100%)</b>



Table 2-3b Referral rates by gender, age, ethnicity, and circuit for 2011 (unduplicated)

	State	Honolulu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Gender</b>					
Male	1043 (57.8%)	566 (56.9%)	127 (61.1%)	237 (57.7%)	113 (59.8%)
Female	760 (42.2%)	429 (43.1%)	81 (38.9%)	174 (42.3%)	76 (40.2%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>1803 (100%)</b>	<b>995 (100%)</b>	<b>208 (100%)</b>	<b>411 (100%)</b>	<b>189 (100%)</b>
<b>Age</b>					
10	10 (0.6%)	5 (0.5%)	1 (0.5%)	3 (0.7%)	1 (0.5%)
11	29 (1.6%)	7 (0.7%)	3 (1.4%)	17 (4.1%)	2 (1.1%)
12	65 (3.6%)	30 (3.0%)	5 (2.4%)	22 (5.3%)	8 (4.2%)
13	153 (8.5%)	75 (7.5%)	19 (9.1%)	44 (10.7%)	15 (7.9%)
14	281 (15.6%)	146 (14.7%)	32 (15.4%)	79 (19.2%)	24 (12.7%)
15	419 (23.2%)	248 (24.9%)	55 (26.4%)	76 (18.4%)	40 (21.2%)
16	438 (24.3%)	259 (26.0%)	48 (23.1%)	82 (19.9%)	49 (25.9%)
17	409 (22.7%)	225 (22.6%)	45 (21.6%)	89 (21.6%)	50 (26.5%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>1804 (100%)</b>	<b>995 (100%)</b>	<b>208 (100%)</b>	<b>412 (100%)</b>	<b>189 (100%)</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>					
Caucasian	388 (21.6%)	163 (16.4%)	51 (24.5%)	110 (27.0%)	64 (33.9%)
Hawaiian	553(30.7%)	321 (32.3%)	63 (30.3%)	104 (25.5%)	65 (34.4%)
African American	54 (3.0%)	42 (4.2%)	2 (1.0%)	9 (2.2%)	1 (0.5%)
Chinese	12 (0.7%)	11 (1.1%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.2%)	0 (0%)
Filipino	284 (15.8%)	166 (16.7%)	45 (21.6%)	47 (11.5%)	26 (13.8%)
Japanese	81 (4.5%)	46 (4.6%)	9 (4.3%)	19 (4.7%)	7 (3.7%)
Korean	9 (0.5%)	7 (0.7%)	1 (0.5%)	1 (0.2%)	0 (0%)
Latino/ Hispanic	47 (2.6%)	28 (2.8%)	6 (2.9%)	12 (2.9%)	1 (0.5%)
Native American	4 (0.2%)	1 (0.1%)	0 (0%)	3 (0.7%)	0 (0%)
Other Asian/ Mixed					
Asian	13 (0.7%)	12 (1.2%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Other Pacific					
Islander/ Mixed					
Pacific Islander	120 (6.7%)	94 (9.4%)	12 (5.8%)	12 (2.9%)	2 (1.0%)
Samoan	85 (4.7%)	79 (7.9%)	0 (0%)	5 (1.2%)	1 (0.5%)
Other	23 (1.3%)	0 (0%)	8 (3.8%)	15 (3.7%)	0 (0%)
Unknown	127 (7.1%)	25 (2.5%)	10 (4.8%)	70 (17.2%)	22 (11.6%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>1800 (100%)</b>	<b>995 (100%)</b>	<b>208 (100%)</b>	<b>408 (100%)</b>	<b>189 (100%)</b>

Table 3-1a Diversion rates by type of offense and circuit for 2009 (duplicated)

	State	Honolulu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Total diversions</b>	4046 (100%)	2146 (100%)	489 (100%)	1088 (100%)	325 (100%)
<b>Diversion rates*</b>	30.4	23.5	30.7	57.3	48.1
<b>Type of Offense*</b>					
Drug	154 (3.8%)	13 (0.6%)	21 (4.3%)	113 (10.4%)	7 (2.2%)
Person	84 (2.1%)	8 (0.4%)	3 (0.6%)	66 (6.1%)	7 (2.2%)
Property	392 (9.7%)	122 (5.7%)	75 (15.3%)	165 (15.2%)	30 (9.2%)
Sex	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Status	3258 (80.5%)	1983 (92.4%)	374 (76.5%)	638 (58.7%)	263 (80.9%)
Person NC	52 (1.3%)	4 (0.2%)	4 (0.8%)	41 (3.8%)	3 (0.9%)
Other	81 (2.0%)	7 (0.3%)	7 (1.4%)	59 (5.4%)	8 (2.5%)

Table 3-2a Diversion rates by type of offense and circuit for 2010 (duplicated)

	State	Honolulu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Total diversions</b>	5078 (100%)	2391 (100%)	519 (100%)	1550 (100%)	618 (100%)
<b>Diversion rates*</b>	38.2	26.2	32.6	81.8	91.4
<b>Type of Offense*</b>					
Drug	196 (3.9%)	29 (1.2%)	18 (3.5%)	145 (9.4%)	4 (0.6%)
Person	135 (2.7%)	10 (0.4%)	1 (0.2%)	115 (7.4%)	9 (1.5%)
Property	472 (9.3%)	188 (7.9%)	46 (8.9%)	208 (13.3%)	32 (5.2%)
Sex	2 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.3%)
Status	4080 (80.3%)	2143 (89.6%)	433 (83.4%)	944 (60.9%)	560 (90.6%)
Person NC	72 (1.4%)	7 (0.3%)	1 (0.2%)	60 (3.9%)	4 (0.6%)
Other	95 (1.9%)	6 (0.3%)	9 (1.7%)	75 (4.8%)	5 (0.8%)

Table 3-3a Diversion rates by type of offense and circuit 2011 (duplicated)

	State	Honolulu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Total diversions</b>	3074 (100%)	1639 (100%)	234 (100%)	902 (100%)	299 (100%)
<b>Diversion rates*</b>	23.1	18.0	14.7	47.6	44.2
<b>Type of Offense*</b>					
Drug	135 (4.5%)	13 (0.8%)	10 (4.3%)	114 (12.6%)	0 (0%)
Person	60 (2.0%)	6 (0.4%)	2 (0.9%)	49 (5.4%)	3 (1.0%)
Property	268 (8.7%)	92 (5.6%)	30 (12.8%)	127 (14.1%)	19 (6.4%)
Sex	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Status	2470 (80.4%)	1512 (92.3%)	179 (76.5%)	508 (56.1%)	273 (91.3%)
Person NC	52 (1.7%)	2 (0.1%)	1 (0.4%)	47 (5.2%)	2 (0.7%)
Other	66 (2.1%)	10 (0.6%)	1 (0.4%)	53 (5.9%)	2 (0.7%)

\* General population information on youth ages between 10 and 17 were taken from census 2010 to calculate referral rates.

\* The sum of the seven charges may not add up to the total due to missing data.

Table 3-1b Diversion rates by gender, age, ethnicity, and circuit for 2009 (unduplicated)

	State	Honolulu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Gender</b>					
Male	1059 (55%)	483 (51.%)	180 (55%)	316 (59%)	80 (80%)
Female	879 (45%)	458 (49%)	149 (45%)	219 (41%)	53 (40%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>1938 (100%)</b>	<b>941(100%)</b>	<b>329 (100%)</b>	<b>535 (100%)</b>	<b>133 (100%)</b>
<b>Age</b>					
10	12 (0.6%)	6 (0.6%)	3 (0.9%)	3 (0.8%)	0 (0%)
11	54 (2.8%)	22 (2.3%)	15 (4.6%)	13 (2.4%)	4 (3.0%)
12	98 (5.0%)	44 (4.6%)	21 (6.4%)	25 (4.7%)	8 (6.0%)
13	205 (10.5%)	111 (11.7%)	30 (9.1%)	54 (10.1%)	10 (7.5%)
14	361 (18.6%)	215 (22.7%)	56 (17.0%)	66 (12.3%)	24 (18.0%)
15	533 (27.4%)	289 (30.5%)	75 (22.8%)	138 (25.8%)	31 (23.3%)
16	364 (18.7%)	155 (16.4%)	69 (21.0%)	113 (21.1%)	27 (20.3%)
17	317 (16.3%)	105 (11.1%)	60 (18.2%)	123 (23.0%)	29 (21.8%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>1944 (100%)</b>	<b>947 (100%)</b>	<b>329(100%)</b>	<b>535 (100%)</b>	<b>133 (100%)</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>					
Caucasian	426 (22.4%)	167 (17.9%)	90 (27.7%)	136 (26.5%)	33 (25.8%)
Hawaiian	586(30.9%)	273 (29.3%)	101 (31.1%)	169 (32.9%)	43 (33.6%)
African American	53 (2.8%)	38 (4.1%)	6 (1.8%)	7 (1.4%)	2 (1.6%)
Chinese	19 (1.0%)	13 (1.4%)	0 (0%)	5 (1.0%)	1 (0.8%)
Filipino	329 (17.3%)	179 (19.2%)	66 (20.3%)	63 (12.3%)	21 (16.4%)
Japanese	95 (5.0%)	59 (6.3%)	18 (5.5%)	16 (3.1%)	2 (1.6%)
Korean	13 (0.7%)	10 (1.1%)	0 (0%)	3 (0.6%)	0 (0%)
Latino/ Hispanic	59 (3.1%)	25 (2.7%)	13 (4.0%)	18 (3.5%)	3 (2.3%)
Native American	4 (0.2%)	3 (0.3%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.2%)	0 (0%)
Other Asian/ Mixed					
Asian	18(0.9%)	18 (1.9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Other Pacific					
Islander/ Mixed					
Pacific Islander	103 (5.4%)	73 (7.8%)	16 (4.9%)	12 (2.3%)	2 (1.6%)
Samoan	62 (3.3%)	55 (5.9%)	1 (0.3%)	6 (1.2%)	0 (0%)
Other	29 (1.5%)	1 (0.1%)	10 (3.1%)	17(3.3%)	1 (0.8%)
Unknown	102 (5.4%)	17 (1.8%)	4 (1.2%)	61 (11.9%)	20 (15.6%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>1898(100%)</b>	<b>931 (100%)</b>	<b>325(100%)</b>	<b>514(100%)</b>	<b>128 (100%)</b>

Table 3-2b Diversion rates by gender, age, ethnicity, and circuit for 2010 (unduplicated)

	State	Honolulu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Gender</b>					
Male	1208 (55%)	526 (51%)	177(58%)	421 (60.%)	84 (54.5%)
Female	979 (45%)	500 (49%)	129 (42%)	280 (40%)	70 (45.5%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>2187 (100%)</b>	<b>1026 (100%)</b>	<b>306 (100%)</b>	<b>701 (100%)</b>	<b>154 (100%)</b>
<b>Age</b>					
10	19 (0.9%)	8 (0.8%)	1 (0.3%)	9 (1.3%)	1 (0.6%)
11	43 (2.0%)	8 (0.8%)	12 (3.9%)	20 (2.8%)	3 (1.9%)
12	93 (4.2%)	44 (4.3%)	15 (4.9%)	33 (4.7%)	1 (0.6%)
13	200 (9.1%)	95 (9.2%)	26 (8.5%)	67 (9.5%)	12 (7.8%)
14	347 (15.8%)	172 (16.8%)	48 (15.0%)	105 (15.0%)	24 (15.6%)
15	522 (23.8%)	277 (26.8%)	71 (23.2%)	139 (19.8%)	35 (22.7%)
16	560 (25.5%)	280 (27.1%)	71 (23.2%)	183 (23.2%)	46 (29.9%)
17	412 (18.8%)	150 (14.5%)	64 (20.9%)	166 (23.6%)	32 (20.8%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>2196 (100%)</b>	<b>1034 (100%)</b>	<b>306 (100%)</b>	<b>702(100%)</b>	<b>154 (100%)</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>					
Caucasian	495 (22.9%)	177(17.3%)	99 (32.6%)	176 (25.7%)	43 (28.1%)
Hawaiian	648 (29.9%)	306 (29.9%)	87 (28.6%)	204 (29.7%)	51 (33.3%)
African American	59 (2.7%)	43 (4.2%)	3 (1.0%)	13 (1.9%)	0 (0%)
Chinese	20 (0.9%)	14 (1.4%)	0 (0%)	6 (0.9%)	0 (0%)
Filipino	365 (16.9%)	211(20.6%)	68 (22.4%)	63 (9.2%)	23 (15.0%)
Japanese	120 (5.5%)	63 (6.2%)	11 (3.6%)	36 (5.2%)	10 (6.5%)
Korean	25 (1.1%)	19 (1.9%)	3 (1.0%)	1 (0.1%)	0 (0%)
Latino/ Hispanic	49 (2.3%)	19 (1.9%)	8 (2.6%)	20 (2.9%)	2 (1.3%)
Native American	4 (0.2%)	1 (0.1%)	1 (0.3%)	2 (0.3%)	0 (0%)
Other Asian/ Mixed					
Asian	17 (0.8%)	16 (1.6%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.1%)	0 (0%)
Other Pacific					
Islander/ Mixed					
Pacific Islander	120 (5.5%)	76 (7.4%)	14 (4.6%)	28 (3.8%)	4 (2.6%)
Samoan	66 (3.0%)	56 (5.5%)	2 (0.7%)	6 (0.9%)	2 (1.3%)
Other	23 (1.1%)	0 (0%)	5 (1.6%)	17 (2.5%)	1 (0.7%)
Unknown	157 (7.2%)	22 (2.2%)	3 (1.0%)	115 (16.8%)	17 (11.1%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>2166 (100%)</b>	<b>1023 (100%)</b>	<b>304 (100%)</b>	<b>686 (100%)</b>	<b>153(100%)</b>

Table 3-3b Diversion rates by gender, age, ethnicity, and circuit for 2011 (unduplicated)

	State	Honolulu	MauI	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Gender</b>					
Male	775 (52.9%)	376 (50.5%)	98 (80%)	247 (54.3%)	54 (52.9%)
Female	689 (47.0%)	369 (49.5%)	65 (40%)	207 (45.5%)	48 (47.1%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>1465 (100%)</b>	<b>745 (100%)</b>	<b>163 (100%)</b>	<b>455 (100%)</b>	<b>102 (100%)</b>
<b>Age</b>					
10	7 (0.5%)	5 (0.7%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.4%)	0 (0%)
11	24 (1.6%)	5 (0.7%)	2 (1.2%)	14 (3.1%)	3 (2.9%)
12	47 (3.2%)	21 (2.8%)	5 (3.1%)	21 (4.6%)	0 (0%)
13	128 (8.7%)	55 (7.5%)	15 (9.2%)	54 (11.9%)	4 (3.9%)
14	227 (15.5%)	111 (14.9%)	27 (16.6%)	77 (16.9%)	12 (11.8%)
15	309 (21.1%)	163 (21.9%)	37 (22.7%)	88 (19.3%)	21 (20.6%)
16	388 (26.5%)	218 (29.3%)	43 (26.4%)	97 (21.3%)	30 (29.4%)
17	355 (22.9%)	167 (22.4%)	34 (20.9%)	102 (22.4%)	32 (31.4%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>1465 (100%)</b>	<b>745 (100%)</b>	<b>163 (100%)</b>	<b>455(100%)</b>	<b>102 (100%)</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>					
Caucasian	318 (21.9%)	140 (18.8%)	35 (21.8%)	114 (25.6%)	29 (28.7%)
Hawaiian	429 (29.5%)	234 (31.4%)	49 (30.2%)	125 (28.1%)	21 (20.8%)
African American	45 (3.1%)	34 (4.6%)	1 (0.6%)	10 (2.2%)	0 (0%)
Chinese	11 (0.8%)	8 (1.1%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.4%)	1 (1.0%)
Filipino	227 (15.6%)	120 (16.1%)	48 (28.4%)	44 (9.9%)	17 (16.8%)
Japanese	69 (4.7%)	32 (4.3%)	12 (7.4%)	22 (4.9%)	3 (3.0%)
Korean	6 (0.4%)	4 (0.5%)	1 (0.6%)	1 (0.2%)	0 (0%)
Latino/ Hispanic	38 (2.6%)	21 (2.8%)	4 (2.5%)	12 (2.7%)	1 (1.0%)
Native American	5 (0.3%)	3 (0.4%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.4%)	0 (0%)
Other Asian/ Mixed Asian	12 (0.8%)	10 (1.3%)	1 (0.6%)	1 (0.2%)	0 (0%)
Other Pacific Islander/ Mixed Pacific Islander	92 (6.3%)	71 (9.5%)	5 (3.1%)	14 (3.1%)	2 (2.0%)
Samoan	53 (3.6%)	50 (6.7%)	0 (0%)	3 (0.7%)	0 (0%)
Other	17 (1.2%)	0 (0%)	4 (2.5%)	13 (2.9%)	0 (0%)
Unknown	131 (9.0%)	18 (2.4%)	4 (2.5%)	82 (18.4%)	27 (26.7%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>1453 (100%)</b>	<b>745 (100%)</b>	<b>162 (100%)</b>	<b>445 (100%)</b>	<b>101 (100%)</b>

Table 4-1a Petition rates by type of offense and circuit for 2009 (duplicated)

	State	Honolulu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Total petitions</b>	5015 (100%)	2203 (100%)	1562 (100%)	472 (100%)	778 (100%)
<b>Petition rates</b>	37.7	24.1	98.2	24.9	115.0
<b>Type of Offense</b>					
Drug	447 (8.9%)	73 (3.3%)	218 (14.0%)	63 (13.3%)	93 (12.0%)
Person	609 (12.1%)	306 (13.9%)	127 (8.1%)	55 (11.7%)	121 (15.6%)
Property	1177 (23.5%)	394 (17.9%)	359 (23.0%)	159 (33.7%)	265 (34.1%)
Sex	71 (1.4%)	54 (2.5%)	3 (0.2%)	10 (2.1%)	4 (0.5%)
Status	1204 (24.0%)	570 (25.9%)	480 (30.7%)	73 (15.5%)	81 (10.1%)
Person NC	234 (4.7%)	71 (3.2%)	75 (4.8%)	25 (5.3%)	63 (8.1%)
Other	1273 (25.4%)	735 (33.4%)	300 (19.2%)	87 (18.4%)	151 (19.4%)

Table 4-2a Petition rates by type of offense and circuit for 2010 (duplicated)

	State	Honolulu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Total petitions</b>	4184(100%)	1852 (100%)	1348 (100%)	600 (100%)	394 (100%)
<b>Petition rates</b>	31.5	20.3	84.7	31.7	58.3
<b>Type of Offense</b>					
Drug	459 (10.9%)	88 (4.8%)	238 (17.7%)	86 (14.3%)	47 (11.9%)
Person	506 (12.1%)	322 (17.4%)	42 (3.1%)	73 (12.2%)	69 (17.5%)
Property	1089 (26.0%)	386 (20.8%)	368 (27.3%)	205 (34.2%)	130 (33.0%)
Sex	97 (2.3%)	68 (3.7%)	1 (0.1%)	17 (2.8%)	11 (2.8%)
Status	878 (20.9%)	362 (19.5%)	390 (28.9%)	107 (17.8%)	19 (4.8%)
Person NC	205 (4.9%)	89 (4.8%)	51 (3.8%)	26 (4.3%)	39 (9.9%)
Other	960 (22.9%)	537(29.0%)	258 (19.1%)	86 (14.3%)	79 (20.1%)

Table 4-3a Petition rates by type of offense and circuit for 2011 (duplicated)

	State	Honolulu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Total petitions</b>	1762 (100%)	945 (100%)	310 (100%)	218 (100%)	289 (100%)
<b>Petition rates</b>	13.2	10.3	19.5	11.5	42.7
<b>Type of Offense</b>					
Drug	126 (7.2%)	19 (2.0%)	36 (11.6%)	30 (13.8%)	41 (14.2%)
Person	295 (16.7%)	208 (22.0%)	17 (5.5%)	23 (10.6%)	47 (16.3%)
Property	368 (20.9%)	143 (15.1%)	75 (25.2%)	61 (28.0%)	89 (30.8%)
Sex	73 (4.1%)	61 (6.5%)	1 (0.3%)	4 (1.8%)	7 (2.4%)
Status	317 (18.0%)	183 (19.4%)	92 (29.7%)	40 (18.3%)	2 (0.7%)
Person NC	103 (5.8%)	38 (4.0%)	15 (4.8%)	7 (3.2%)	43 (14.9%)
Other	480 (27.2%)	293 (31.0%)	74 (23.9%)	53 (24.3%)	60 (20.8%)

**Table 4-1b Petition rates by gender, age and ethnicity, and circuit for 2009  
(unduplicated)**

	State	Honolulu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Gender</b>					
Male	802 (87.3%)	336 (87.6%)	177 (65.6%)	151 (69.9%)	138 (66.3%)
Female	389 (32.7%)	161 (32.4%)	93 (34.4%)	65 (30.1%)	70 (33.7%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>1191 (100%)</b>	<b>497 (100%)</b>	<b>270 (100%)</b>	<b>216 (100%)</b>	<b>208 (100%)</b>
<b>Age</b>					
10	4 (0.3%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.7%)	1 (0.5%)	1 (0.5%)
11	10 (0.8%)	1 (0.2%)	1 (0.4%)	4 (1.9%)	4 (1.9%)
12	28 (2.4%)	7 (1.4%)	9 (3.3%)	5 (2.3%)	7 (3.4%)
13	81 (6.8%)	40 (8.0%)	16 (5.9%)	9 (4.2%)	16 (7.7%)
14	144 (12.1%)	64 (12.9%)	32 (11.9%)	24 (11.1%)	24 (11.5%)
15	249 (20.9%)	102 (20.5%)	60 (22.2%)	46 (21.3%)	41 (19.7%)
16	274 (23.0%)	114 (22.9%)	54 (20.0%)	58 (26.9%)	48 (23.1%)
17	401 (33.7%)	169 (34.0%)	96 (35.6%)	69 (11.9%)	67 (32.2%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>1191 (100%)</b>	<b>497 (100%)</b>	<b>270 (100%)</b>	<b>216 (100%)</b>	<b>208 (100%)</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>					
Caucasian	270 (22.7%)	77 (15.5%)	83 (30.7%)	53 (24.7%)	57 (27.4%)
Hawaiian	399 (33.5%)	167 (33.6%)	91 (33.7%)	75 (34.9%)	68 (33.7%)
African American	25 (2.1%)	18 (3.6%)	2 (0.7%)	4 (1.9%)	1 (0.5%)
Chinese	10 (0.8%)	7 (1.4%)	3 (1.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Filipino	218 (18.3%)	84 (16.9%)	58 (21.5%)	23 (10.7%)	53 (25.5%)
Japanese	55 (4.6%)	33 (6.6%)	8 (3.0%)	5 (2.3%)	9 (4.3%)
Korean	8 (0.7%)	7 (1.4%)	1 (0.4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Latino/ Hispanic	30 (2.5%)	13 (2.6%)	6 (2.2%)	7 (3.3%)	4 (1.9%)
Native American	1 (0.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0%)
Other Asian/ Mixed					
Asian	8 (0.7%)	6 (1.2%)	1 (0.4%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0%)
Other Pacific					
Islander/ Mixed					
Pacific Islander	47 (3.9%)	32 (6.4%)	4 (1.5%)	7 (3.3%)	4 (1.9%)
Samoaan	45 (3.8%)	43 (8.7%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.9%)	0 (0%)
Other	15 (1.3%)	0 (0%)	5 (1.9%)	9 (4.2%)	1 (0.5%)
Unknown	59 (5.0%)	10 (2.0%)	8 (3.0%)	28 (13.0%)	13 (6.3%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>1190 (100%)</b>	<b>497 (100%)</b>	<b>270 (100%)</b>	<b>215 (100%)</b>	<b>208 (100%)</b>

Table 4-2b Petition rates by gender, age, ethnicity and circuit for 2010 (unduplicated)

	State	Honolulu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Gender</b>					
Male	894 (65.9%)	398 (65.0%)	200 (63.5%)	194 (67.4%)	102 (71.8%)
Female	463 (34.1%)	214 (35.0%)	115 (36.5%)	94 (32.6%)	40 (28.2%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>1357 (100%)</b>	<b>612 (100%)</b>	<b>315 (100%)</b>	<b>288 (100%)</b>	<b>142 (100%)</b>
<b>Age</b>					
10	13 (1.0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.3%)	11 (3.8%)	1 (0.7%)
11	15 (1.1%)	3 (0.5%)	3 (1.0%)	9 (3.1%)	0 (0%)
12	38 (2.8%)	15 (2.5%)	7 (2.2%)	13 (4.5%)	3 (2.1%)
13	90 (6.6%)	41 (6.7%)	16 (5.1%)	23 (8.0%)	10 (7.0%)
14	148 (10.8%)	73 (11.9%)	30 (9.5%)	30 (10.4%)	13 (9.2%)
15	275 (20.3%)	123 (20.1%)	65 (20.6%)	58 (20.1%)	29 (20.4%)
16	368 (27.1%)	179 (29.2%)	77 (24.4%)	72 (25.0%)	40 (28.2%)
17	412 (30.7%)	178 (29.1%)	116 (36.8%)	72 (25.0%)	46 (32.4%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>1357 (100%)</b>	<b>612 (100%)</b>	<b>315 (100%)</b>	<b>288 (100%)</b>	<b>142 (100%)</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>					
Caucasian	289 (21.3%)	90 (14.7%)	85 (27.0%)	70 (24.3%)	44 (31.0%)
Hawaiian	435 (32.1%)	193 (31.5%)	99 (31.4%)	99 (34.4%)	44 (31.0%)
African American	32 (2.4%)	23 (3.8%)	2 (0.6%)	3 (1.0%)	4 (2.8%)
Chinese	15 (1.1%)	8 (1.3%)	3 (1.0%)	3 (1.0%)	1 (0.7%)
Fillipino	215 (15.8%)	102 (16.7%)	70 (22.2%)	15 (5.2%)	28 (19.7%)
Japanese	59 (4.3%)	37 (6.0%)	9 (2.9%)	8 (2.8%)	5 (3.5%)
Korean	9 (0.7%)	7 (1.1%)	1 (0.3%)	1 (0.3%)	0 (0%)
Latino/ Hispanic	44 (3.2%)	15 (2.5%)	17 (5.4%)	11 (3.8%)	1 (0.7%)
Native American	5 (0.4%)	1 (0.2%)	0 (0%)	4 (1.4%)	0 (0%)
Other Asian/ Mixed					
Asian	15 (1.1%)	14 (2.3%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.3%)	0 (0%)
Other Pacific					
Islander/ Mixed					
Pacific Islander	88 (6.5%)	74 (12.1%)	6 (1.9%)	4 (1.4%)	4 (2.8%)
Samoan	48 (3.5%)	43 (7.0%)	2 (0.6%)	2 (0.7%)	1 (0.7%)
Other	20 (2.1%)	0 (0%)	11 (3.5%)	17 (5.9%)	1 (0.7%)
Unknown	74 (5.5%)	5 (0.8%)	10 (3.2%)	50 (17.4%)	9 (6.3%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>1357 (100%)</b>	<b>612 (100%)</b>	<b>315 (100%)</b>	<b>288 (100%)</b>	<b>142 (100%)</b>



Table 4-3b Petition rates by gender, age, ethnicity, and circuit for 2011 (unduplicated)

	State	Honolulu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Gender</b>					
Male	551 (65%)	302 (66.8%)	80 (62.5%)	83 (62.9%)	86 (63.7%)
Female	296 (35%)	150 (33.2%)	48 (37.5%)	49 (37.1%)	49 (36.3%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>847 (100%)</b>	<b>452 (100%)</b>	<b>128 (100%)</b>	<b>132 (100%)</b>	<b>135 (100%)</b>
<b>Age</b>					
10	3 (0.4%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.8%)	2 (1.5%)	0 (0%)
11	10 (1.2%)	1 (0.2%)	1 (0.8%)	7 (5.3%)	1 (0.7%)
12	25 (3.0%)	10 (2.2%)	2 (1.6%)	6 (4.5%)	7 (5.2%)
13	51 (6.0%)	29 (6.4%)	6 (4.9%)	2 (1.5%)	14 (10.4%)
14	122 (14.4%)	56 (12.4%)	22 (17.2%)	28 (21.2%)	16 (11.9%)
15	194 (22.9%)	116 (25.7%)	31 (24.2%)	20 (15.2%)	27 (20.0%)
16	213 (25.1%)	123 (27.2%)	26 (20.3%)	27 (20.5%)	37 (27.4%)
17	229 (27.0%)	117 (25.9%)	39 (30.5%)	40 (30.3%)	33 (24.4%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>847 (100%)</b>	<b>452 (100%)</b>	<b>128 (100%)</b>	<b>132 (100%)</b>	<b>135 (100%)</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>					
Caucasian	180 (21.3%)	59 (13.1%)	33 (25.8%)	41 (31.1%)	47 (34.8%)
Hawaiian	294 (34.7%)	149 (33.0%)	47 (36.7%)	39 (29.5%)	59 (43.7%)
African American	25 (3.0%)	19 (4.2%)	1 (0.8%)	4 (3.0%)	1 (0.7%)
Chinese	9 (1.1%)	6 (1.3%)	1 (0.8%)	2 (1.5%)	0 (0%)
Filipino	123 (14.5%)	74 (16.4%)	17 (13.3%)	14 (10.6%)	18 (13.3%)
Japanese	38 (4.5%)	24 (5.3%)	4 (3.1%)	5 (3.8%)	5 (3.7%)
Korean	4 (0.5%)	4 (0.9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Latino/ Hispanic	23 (2.7%)	15 (3.3%)	3 (2.3%)	4 (3.0%)	1 (0.7%)
Native American	1 (0.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.8%)	0 (0%)
Other Asian/ Mixed					
Asian	6 (0.7%)	6 (1.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Other Pacific					
Islander/ Mixed					
Pacific Islander	51 (6.0%)	41 (9.1%)	8 (6.3%)	1 (0.8%)	1 (0.7%)
Samoan	51 (6.0%)	46 (10.2%)	0 (0%)	4 (3.0%)	1 (0.7%)
Other	11 (1.3%)	0 (0%)	5 (3.9%)	5 (3.8%)	1 (0.7%)
Unknown	31 (3.7%)	9 (2.0%)	9 (7.0%)	12 (9.1%)	1 (0.7%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>847 (100%)</b>	<b>452 (100%)</b>	<b>128 (100%)</b>	<b>132 (100%)</b>	<b>135 (100%)</b>

**Table 5-1a Detention rates for the state for year 2009, 2010, and 2011 (duplicated)**

	2009	2010	2011
<b>Total adjudications</b>	1074	844	517
<b>Detention rates*</b>	8.1	6.3	3.9

**Table 5-1b Detention rates by gender, age, and ethnicity for 2009-2011 (unduplicated)**

	2009	2010	2011
<b>Gender</b>			
Male	294 (69%)	200 (65%)	217 (71%)
Female	133 (31%)	106 (35%)	87 (29%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>427 (100%)</b>	<b>306 (100%)</b>	<b>304 (100%)</b>
<b>Age</b>			
10	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
11	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
12	5 (1.2%)	5 (1.6%)	5 (1.6%)
13	23 (5.4%)	15 (4.9%)	16 (5.3%)
14	52 (12.1%)	31 (10.1%)	28 (9.2%)
15	76 (17.7%)	56 (18.2%)	54 (17.8%)
16	125 (29.1%)	79 (25.7%)	102 (33.6%)
17	147 (34.3%)	120 (39.1%)	99 (32.6%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>428 (100%)</b>	<b>306 (100%)</b>	<b>304 (100%)</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>			
Caucasian	83 (19.3%)	61 (19.9%)	50 (16.4%)
Hawaiian	155 (36.1%)	105 (34.2%)	105 (34.5%)
African American	17 (4.0%)	14 (4.6%)	14 (4.6%)
Chinese	4 (0.9%)	2 (0.7%)	5 (1.6%)
Filipino	59 (13.8%)	40 (13.0%)	35 (11.5%)
Japanese	22 (5.1%)	20 (6.5%)	21 (6.9%)
Korean	4 (0.9%)	1 (0.3%)	1 (0.3%)
Latino/ Hispanic	19 (4.4%)	9 (2.9%)	9 (3.0%)
Native American	0 (0%)	2 (0.7%)	0 (0%)
Other Asian/ Mixed			
Asian	5 (1.2%)	31 (10.1%)	4 (1.3%)
Other Pacific			
Islander/ Mixed			23 (7.6%)
Pacific Islander	19 (4.4%)	0 (0%)	
Samoaan	39 (9.1%)	20 (6.5%)	33 (10.9%)
Other	1 (0.2%)	1 (0.3%)	1 (0.3%)
Unknown	2 (0.5%)	1 (0.3%)	3 (1.0%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>429 (100%)</b>	<b>307 (100%)</b>	<b>304 (100%)</b>

**Table 6-1a Adjudication rates by type of offense and by circuit for 2009 (duplicated)**

	State	Honolulu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Total adjudications</b>	1979 (100%)	1132 (100%)	298 (100%)	253 (100%)	296 (100%)
<b>Adjudication rates</b>	14.9	12.4	18.7	13.3	43.8
<b>Type of Offense*</b>					
Drug	152 (7.7%)	46 (4.1%)	47 (15.8%)	32 (12.6%)	27 (9.1%)
Person	288 (14.6%)	196 (17.3%)	30 (10.1%)	20 (7.9%)	42 (14.2%)
Property	490 (24.8%)	260 (23.0%)	67 (22.5%)	80 (31.6%)	83 (28.0%)
Sex	24 (1.2%)	21 (1.9%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.4%)	2 (0.7%)
Status	676 (34.2%)	472 (41.7%)	89 (29.9%)	52 (20.6%)	63 (21.3%)
Person NC	84 (4.2%)	44 (3.9%)	13 (4.4%)	13 (5.1%)	14 (4.7%)
Other	265 (13.4%)	93 (8.2%)	52 (17.4%)	55 (21.7%)	65 (22.0%)

**Table 6-2a Adjudication rates by type of offense and circuit for 2010 (duplicated)**

	State	Honolulu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Total adjudications</b>	2358 (100%)	1104 (100%)	530 (100%)	419 (100%)	305 (100%)
<b>Adjudication rates</b>	17.7	12.1	33.3	22.1	45.1
<b>Type of Offense*</b>					
Drug	251 (10.6%)	64 (5.8%)	107 (20.2%)	51 (12.2%)	29 (9.5%)
Person	356 (15.1%)	2208 (18.8%)	41 (7.7%)	42 (10.0%)	65 (21.3%)
Property	676 (28.7%)	301 (27.3%)	118 (22.3%)	158 (37.7%)	99 (32.5%)
Sex	59 (2.5%)	37 (3.4%)	1 (0.2%)	13 (3.1%)	8 (2.6%)
Status	584 (24.8%)	357 (32.3%)	134 (25.3%)	74 (17.7%)	19 (6.2%)
Person NC	119 (5.0%)	67 (6.1%)	18 (3.4%)	14 (3.3%)	20 (6.6%)
Other	313 (13.3%)	70 (6.3%)	111 (20.9%)	67 (16.0%)	65 (21.3%)

**Table 6-3a Adjudication rates by type of offense and circuit for 2011 (duplicated)**

	State	Honolulu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Total Adjudications</b>	1598 (100%)	694 (100%)	394 (100%)	348 (100%)	162 (100%)
<b>Adjudication rates</b>	12.0	7.6	24.8	18.4	24.0
<b>Type of Offense*</b>					
Drug	170 (10.6%)	27 (3.9%)	71 (18.0%)	51 (14.7%)	21 (13.0%)
Person	286 (17.9%)	182 (26.2%)	19 (4.8%)	48 (13.8%)	37 (22.8%)
Property	434 (27.2%)	163 (23.5%)	118 (29.9%)	96 (27.6%)	57 (35.2%)
Sex	54 (3.4%)	43 (6.2%)	0 (0%)	9 (2.6%)	2 (1.2%)
Status	347 (21.7%)	188 (27.1%)	99 (25.1%)	59 (17.0%)	1 (0.6%)
Person NC	72 (4.5%)	28 (4.0%)	12 (3.0%)	18 (5.2%)	14 (8.6%)
Other	235 (14.7%)	63 (9.1%)	75 (19.0%)	67 (19.3%)	30 (18.5%)

\* General population information on youth ages between 10 and 17 were taken from census 2010 to calculate referral rates.

† The sum of the seven charges may not add up to the total due to missing data.

Table 6-1b Adjudication rates by gender age ethnicity 2009 (unduplicated)

	State	Honolulu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Gender</b>					
Male	440 (65.5%)	234 (64.8%)	62 (67.4%)	81 (71.1%)	63 (60.0%)
Female	232 (34.5%)	127 (35.2%)	30 (32.6%)	33 (28.9%)	42 (40.0%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>672 (100%)</b>	<b>361 (100%)</b>	<b>92 (100%)</b>	<b>114 (100%)</b>	<b>105 (100%)</b>
<b>Age</b>					
10	4 (0.6%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.1%)	2 (1.8%)	1 (1.0%)
11	4 (0.6%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.1%)	2 (1.8%)	1 (1.0%)
12	17 (2.5%)	5 (1.4%)	4 (4.3%)	5 (4.4%)	3 (2.9%)
13	40 (6.0%)	29 (8.0%)	6 (6.5%)	2 (1.8%)	3 (2.9%)
14	80 (11.9%)	50 (13.9%)	6 (6.5%)	10 (8.8%)	14 (13.3%)
15	141 (21.0%)	80 (22.2%)	20 (21.7%)	21 (18.4%)	20 (19.0%)
16	160 (23.8%)	89 (24.7%)	19 (20.7%)	32 (28.1%)	20 (19.0%)
17	226 (33.6%)	108 (29.9%)	35 (38%)	40 (35.1%)	43 (41.0%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>672 (100%)</b>	<b>361 (100%)</b>	<b>92 (100%)</b>	<b>114 (100%)</b>	<b>105 (100%)</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>					
Caucasian	136 (20.3%)	58 (16.1%)	25 (27.2%)	24 (21.2%)	29 (27.6%)
Hawaiian	228 (34.0%)	117 (32.4%)	36 (39.1%)	38 (33.6%)	37 (35.2%)
African American	14 (2.1 %)	12 (3.3%)	0 (0%)	2 (1.8%)	0 (0%)
Chinese	6 (0.9%)	6 (1.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Filipino	113 (16.8%)	59 (16.3%)	18 (19.8%)	15 (13.3%)	21 (20.0%)
Japanese	37 (5.5%)	28 (7.8%)	5 (5.4%)	2 (1.8%)	2 (1.9%)
Korean	6 (0.9%)	6 (1.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Latino/ Hispanic	17 (2.5%)	10 (2.8%)	3 (3.3%)	2 (1.8%)	2 (1.9%)
Native American	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Other Asian/ Mixed					
Asian	5 (0.7%)	5 (1.4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Other Pacific					
Islander/ Mixed	35 (5.2%)	26 (7.2%)	3 (3.3%)	3 (2.7%)	3 (2.9%)
Pacific Islander					
Samoaan	33 (4.9%)	35 (8.9%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.9%)	0 (0%)
Other	5 (0.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (4.4%)	0 (0%)
Unknown	36 (5.4%)	2 (0.6%)	2 (2.2%)	21 (18.6%)	11 (10.5%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>671 (100%)</b>	<b>361 (100%)</b>	<b>92 (100%)</b>	<b>113 (100%)</b>	<b>105 (100%)</b>

Table 6-2b Adjudication rates by gender, age, ethnicity, and circuit 2010 (unduplicated)

	State	Honolulu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Gender</b>					
Male	675 (65.9%)	308 (65.3%)	124 (61.4%)	121 (67.2%)	122 (71.3%)
Female	350 (34.1%)	164 (34.7%)	78 (38.8%)	59 (32.8%)	49 (28.7%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>1025 (100%)</b>	<b>472 (100%)</b>	<b>202 (100%)</b>	<b>180 (100%)</b>	<b>171 (100%)</b>
<b>Age</b>					
10	6 (0.6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (3.3%)	0 (0%)
11	9 (0.9%)	2 (0.4%)	0 (0%)	6 (3.3%)	1 (0.6%)
12	23 (2.2%)	9 (1.9%)	1 (0.5%)	7 (3.9%)	6 (3.5%)
13	66 (6.4%)	32 (6.8%)	8 (4.0%)	13 (7.2%)	13 (7.6%)
14	116 (11.3%)	68 (14.4%)	20 (9.9%)	14 (7.8%)	14 (8.2%)
15	213 (20.8%)	98 (20.8%)	41 (20.3%)	38 (21.1%)	36 (21.1%)
16	290 (28.3%)	134 (28.4%)	56 (27.7%)	51 (28.3%)	49 (28.7%)
17	302 (29.5%)	129 (27.3%)	76 (37.6%)	45 (25.0%)	52 (30.4%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>1025 (100%)</b>	<b>472 (100%)</b>	<b>202 (100%)</b>	<b>180 (100%)</b>	<b>171 (100%)</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>					
Caucasian	222 (21.7%)	67 (14.2%)	64 (31.7%)	51 (28.3%)	40 (23.4%)
Hawaiian	330 (32.2%)	141 (29.9%)	69 (34.2%)	62 (34.4%)	58 (33.9%)
African American	33 (3.2%)	22 (4.7%)	3 (1.5%)	4 (2.2%)	4 (2.3%)
Chinese	14 (1.4%)	8 (1.7%)	2 (1.0%)	3 (1.7%)	1 (0.6%)
Filipino	173 (16.9%)	85 (18.0%)	37 (18.3%)	12 (6.7%)	39 (22.8%)
Japanese	39 (3.8%)	23 (4.9%)	2 (1.0%)	3 (1.7%)	11 (6.4%)
Korean	5 (0.5%)	5 (1.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Latino/ Hispanic	22 (2.1%)	8 (1.7%)	6 (3.0%)	6 (3.3%)	2 (1.2%)
Native American	2 (0.2%)	1 (0.2%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.6%)	0 (0%)
Other Asian/ Mixed					
Asian	11 (1.1%)	10 (2.1%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Other Pacific					
Islander/ Mixed	76 (7.4%)	61 (12.9%)	5 (2.5%)	5 (2.8%)	5 (2.9%)
Pacific Islander					
Samoaan	36 (3.5%)	34 (7.2%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.6%)
Other	14 (1.4%)	0 (0%)	5 (2.5%)	7 (3.9%)	2 (1.2%)
Unknown	48 (4.7%)	7 (1.5%)	7 (3.5%)	26 (14.4%)	8 (4.7%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>1025 (100%)</b>	<b>472 (100%)</b>	<b>202 (100%)</b>	<b>180 (100%)</b>	<b>171 (100%)</b>

Table 6-3b Adjudication rates by gender, age, ethnicity, and circuit 2011 (unduplicated)

	State	Honolulu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Gender</b>					
Male	583 (64.1%)	258 (65.8%)	121 (62.1%)	136 (63.0%)	68 (63.6%)
Female	327 (35.9%)	134 (34.2%)	74 (37.9%)	80 (37.0%)	39 (36.4%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>910 (100%)</b>	<b>392 (100%)</b>	<b>195 (100%)</b>	<b>216 (100%)</b>	<b>107 (100%)</b>
<b>Age</b>					
10	4 (0.4%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.5%)	3 (1.4%)	0 (0%)
11	10 (1.1%)	1 (0.3%)	0 (0%)	9 (4.2%)	0 (0%)
12	14 (1.5%)	6 (1.5%)	1 (0.5%)	5 (2.3%)	2 (1.9%)
13	51 (5.6%)	29 (7.4%)	2 (1.0%)	9 (4.2%)	11 (10.3%)
14	109 (12.0%)	42 (10.7%)	26 (13.3%)	27 (12.5%)	14 (13.1%)
15	200 (22.0%)	108 (27.6%)	35 (17.9%)	38 (16.7%)	21 (19.6%)
16	241 (26.5%)	107 (27.3%)	52 (26.7%)	51 (23.6%)	31 (29.0%)
17	281 (30.9%)	99 (25.3%)	78 (40.0%)	76 (35.2%)	28 (26.2%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>910 (100%)</b>	<b>392 (100%)</b>	<b>195 (100%)</b>	<b>216 (100%)</b>	<b>107 (100%)</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>					
Caucasian	194 (21.3%)	53 (13.5%)	50 (25.6%)	55 (25.5%)	36 (33.6%)
Hawaiian	310 (34.1%)	129 (32.9%)	66 (33.8%)	68 (31.5%)	47 (43.9%)
African American	19 (2.1%)	11 (2.8%)	2 (1.0%)	5 (2.3%)	1 (0.9%)
Chinese	7 (0.8%)	4 (1.0%)	1 (0.5%)	2 (0.9%)	0 (0%)
Filipino	142 (15.6%)	69 (17.6%)	40 (20.5%)	18 (8.3%)	15 (14.0%)
Japanese	45 (4.9%)	23 (5.9%)	9 (4.6%)	9 (4.2%)	4 (3.7%)
Korean	6 (0.7%)	4 (1.0%)	1 (0.5%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0%)
Latino/ Hispanic	31 (3.4%)	13 (3.3%)	7 (3.6%)	10 (4.6%)	1 (0.9%)
Native American	3 (0.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (1.4%)	0 (0%)
Other Asian/ Mixed					
Asian	6 (0.7%)	5 (1.3%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0%)
Other Pacific					
Islander/ Mixed	46 (5.1%)	37 (9.4%)	4 (2.1%)	4 (1.9%)	1 (0.9%)
Pacific Islander					
Samoan	42 (4.6%)	37 (9.4%)	0 (0%)	5 (2.3%)	0 (0%)
Other	14 (1.5%)	0 (0%)	4 (2.1%)	9 (4.2%)	1 (0.9%)
Unknown	45 (4.9%)	7 (1.8%)	11 (5.8%)	26 (12.0%)	1 (0.9%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>910 (100%)</b>	<b>392 (100%)</b>	<b>195 (100%)</b>	<b>216 (100%)</b>	<b>107 (100%)</b>

**Table 7-1a Probation rates by type of offense and circuit for 2009 (duplicated)**

	State	Honolulu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Total probations</b>	914 (100%)	437 (100%)	100 (100%)	285 (100%)	92 (100%)
<b>Probation rates</b>	6.9	4.8	6.3	15.0	13.6
<b>Type of Offense*</b>					
Drug	38 (4.2%)	11 (2.5%)	7 (7.0%)	19 (6.7%)	1 (1.1%)
Person	117 (12.8%)	82 (18.8%)	13 (13.0%)	7 (2.5%)	15 (16.3%)
Property	171 (18.7%)	98 (22.4%)	17 (17.0%)	34 (11.9%)	22 (23.9%)
Sex	12 (1.3%)	10 (2.3%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.4%)	1 (1.1%)
Status	191 (20.9%)	120 (27.5%)	28 (26.0%)	42 (14.7%)	3 (3.3%)
Person NC	27 (3.0%)	18 (4.1%)	0 (0%)	7 (2.5%)	2 (2.2%)
Other	120 (13.1%)	53 (12.1%)	9 (9.0%)	36 (12.6%)	22 (23.9%)

**Table 7-2a Probation rates by type of offense and circuit for 2010 (duplicated)**

	State	Honolulu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Total probations</b>	808 (100.0%)	351 (100%)	91 (100%)	267 (100%)	99 (100%)
<b>Probation rates</b>	6.1	3.8	5.7	14.0	14.6
<b>Type of Offense*</b>					
Drug	38 (4.2%)	23 (6.6%)	11 (12.1%)	28 (10.5%)	1 (1.1%)
Person	117 (12.8%)	68 (19.4%)	6 (6.6%)	16 (6.0%)	15 (16.3%)
Property	171 (18.7%)	79 (22.5%)	23 (25.3%)	58 (21.7%)	22 (23.9%)
Sex	12 (1.3%)	12 (3.4%)	1 (1.1%)	4 (1.5%)	1 (1.1%)
Status	191 (20.9%)	123 (35.0%)	14 (15.4%)	63 (23.6%)	3 (3.3%)
Person NC	27 (3.0%)	20 (5.7%)	5 (5.5%)	8 (3.0%)	2 (2.2%)
Other	120 (13.1%)	14 (4.0%)	12 (13.2%)	26 (9.7%)	22 (23.9%)

**Table 7-3a Probation rates by type of offense, and ethnicity for 2011 (duplicated)**

	State	Honolulu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Total probations</b>	506 (100%)	219 (100%)	75 (100%)	169 (100%)	43 (100%)
<b>Probation rates</b>	3.8	2.4	4.7	8.9	6.4
<b>Type of Offense*</b>					
Drug	43 (8.5%)	9 (4.1%)	6 (8.0%)	27 (16.0%)	1 (2.3%)
Person	88 (17.4%)	62 (28.3%)	5 (6.7%)	13 (7.7%)	8 (18.6%)
Property	115 (22.7%)	52 (23.7%)	16 (21.3%)	36 (21.3%)	11 (25.6%)
Sex	16 (3.2%)	12 (5.5%)	0 (0%)	3 (1.8%)	1 (2.3%)
Status	126 (24.9%)	62 (28.3%)	19 (25.3%)	44 (26.0%)	1 (2.3%)
Person NC	24 (4.7%)	10 (4.6%)	3 (4.0%)	6 (3.6%)	5 (11.6%)
Other	35 (6.9%)	8 (3.7%)	4 (5.3%)	15 (8.9%)	8 (18.6%)

\* General population information on youth ages between 10 and 17 were taken from census 2010 to calculate referral rates.

\* The sum of the seven charges may not add up to the total due to missing data.

Table 7-1b Probation rates by gender, age, ethnicity, by circuit for 2009 (unduplicated)

	State	Honolulu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Gender</b>					
Male	519 (65%)	251 (66%)	54 (64%)	171 (68%)	43 (56%)
Female	274 (35%)	128 (34%)	30 (36%)	82 (32%)	34 (44%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>793 (100%)</b>	<b>379 (100%)</b>	<b>84 (100%)</b>	<b>253 (100%)</b>	<b>77 (100%)</b>
<b>Age</b>					
10	6 (0.8%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.2%)	5 (2.0%)	0 (0%)
11	14 (1.8%)	3 (0.8%)	1 (1.2%)	7 (2.8%)	3 (3.9%)
12	24 (3.0%)	11 (2.9%)	5 (6.0%)	5 (2.0%)	3 (3.9%)
13	72 (9.1%)	44 (11.8%)	11 (13.1%)	15 (5.9%)	2 (2.6%)
14	146 (18.4%)	98 (25.8%)	5 (6.0%)	28 (11.0%)	15 (19.5%)
15	176 (22.1%)	92 (24.2%)	21 (25.0%)	50 (19.7%)	13 (16.9%)
16	216 (27.2%)	88 (23.2%)	28 (33.3%)	73 (28.7%)	27 (35.1%)
17	141 (17.7%)	44 (11.8%)	12 (14.3%)	71 (28.0%)	14 (18.2%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>795 (100%)</b>	<b>380 (100%)</b>	<b>84 (100%)</b>	<b>254 (100%)</b>	<b>77 (100%)</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>					
Caucasian	154 (19.4%)	50 (13.2%)	23 (27.4%)	67 (26.6%)	14 (18.2%)
Hawaiian	275 (34.7%)	126 (33.2%)	29 (34.5%)	84 (33.3%)	36 (46.8%)
African American	21 (2.6%)	17 (4.5%)	2 (2.4%)	1 (0.4%)	1 (1.3%)
Chinese	5 (0.6%)	3 (0.8%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.8%)	0 (0%)
Filipino	111 (14.0%)	60 (15.8%)	11 (13.1%)	28 (11.1%)	12 (15.8%)
Japanese	47 (5.9%)	21 (5.5%)	5 (6.0%)	15 (5.2%)	8 (10.4%)
Korean	6 (0.8%)	5 (1.3%)	1 (1.2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Latino/ Hispanic	22 (2.8%)	9 (2.4%)	6 (7.1%)	7 (2.8%)	0 (0%)
Native American	1 (0.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.3%)
Other Asian/ Mixed					
Asian	10 (1.3%)	10 (2.6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Other Pacific					
Islander/ Mixed					
Pacific Islander	44 (5.5%)	39 (10.3%)	0 (0%)	4 (1.6%)	1 (1.3%)
Samoan	39 (4.9%)	37 (9.7%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.4%)	1 (1.3%)
Other	12 (1.5%)	0 (0%)	4 (4.8%)	8 (3.2%)	0 (0%)
Unknown	46 (5.8%)	3 (0.8%)	3 (3.6%)	37 (14.7%)	3 (3.9%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>793 (100%)</b>	<b>380 (100%)</b>	<b>84 (100%)</b>	<b>252 (100%)</b>	<b>77 (100%)</b>



Table 7-2b Probation rates by gender, age, ethnicity, and circuit for 2010 (unduplicated)

	State	Honolulu	MauI	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Gender</b>					
Male	455 (66%)	195 (62%)	51 (65%)	159 (69%)	50 (72.5%)
Female	234 (34%)	118 (38%)	27 (35%)	70 (31%)	19 (27.5%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>689 (100%)</b>	<b>313 (100%)</b>	<b>78 (100%)</b>	<b>229 (100%)</b>	<b>69 (100%)</b>
<b>Age</b>					
10	8 (1.2%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.3%)	7 (3.0%)	0 (0%)
11	12 (1.7%)	2 (0.6%)	1 (1.3%)	8 (3.5%)	1 (1.4%)
12	25 (3.6%)	6 (1.9%)	4 (5.1%)	11 (4.8%)	4 (5.8%)
13	65 (9.4%)	35 (11.2%)	4 (5.1%)	18 (7.8%)	8 (11.6%)
14	105 (15.2%)	62 (19.8%)	10 (12.8%)	24 (10.4%)	9 (13.1%)
15	165 (23.9%)	93 (29.7%)	13 (16.7%)	42 (18.3%)	17 (24.6%)
16	173 (25.1%)	65 (20.8%)	23 (29.5%)	67 (29.1%)	18 (26.1%)
17	137 (19.9%)	50 (16.0%)	22 (28.2%)	53 (23.0%)	12 (17.4%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>690 (100%)</b>	<b>313 (100%)</b>	<b>78 (100%)</b>	<b>230 (100%)</b>	<b>69 (100%)</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>					
Caucasian	145 (21.0%)	55 (17.6%)	20 (25.6%)	58 (25.2%)	12 (17.4%)
Hawaiian	222 (32.2%)	91 (29.2%)	25 (32.1%)	75 (32.6%)	31 (44.9%)
African American	17 (2.5%)	13 (4.2%)	0 (0%)	4 (1.7%)	0 (0%)
Chinese	8 (1.2%)	3 (1.0%)	2 (2.6%)	3 (1.3%)	0 (0%)
Filipino	110 (16.0%)	59 (18.9%)	15 (19.2%)	15 (6.5%)	21 (30.4%)
Japanese	23 (3.3%)	16 (5.1%)	1 (1.3%)	3 (1.3%)	3 (4.3%)
Korean	3 (0.4%)	3 (1.0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Latino/ Hispanic	18 (2.6%)	7 (2.2%)	1 (1.3%)	10 (4.3%)	0 (0%)
Native American	4 (0.6%)	1 (0.3%)	0 (0%)	3 (1.3%)	0 (0%)
Other Asian/ Mixed					
Asian	7 (1.0%)	6 (1.9%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.4%)	0 (0%)
Other Pacific					
Islander/ Mixed					
Pacific Islander	43 (6.2%)	31 (9.9%)	4 (5.1%)	7 (3.0%)	1 (1.4%)
Samoan	22 (3.2%)	21 (6.7%)	1 (1.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Other	14 (2.0%)	0 (0%)	3 (3.8%)	11 (4.8%)	0 (0%)
Unknown	53 (7.7%)	6 (1.9%)	6 (7.7%)	40 (17.4%)	1 (1.4%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>689 (100%)</b>	<b>312 (100%)</b>	<b>78 (100%)</b>	<b>230 (100%)</b>	<b>69 (100%)</b>

Table 7-3b Probation rates by gender, age, ethnicity, and circuit for 2011 (duplicated)

	State	Honolulu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
<b>Gender</b>					
Male	284 (65%)	132 (67%)	37 (59%)	95 (65%)	20 (61%)
Female	155 (35%)	64 (33%)	26 (41%)	52 (35%)	13 (39%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>439 (100%)</b>	<b>196 (100%)</b>	<b>63 (100%)</b>	<b>147 (100%)</b>	<b>33 (100%)</b>
<b>Age</b>					
10	3 (0.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (2.0%)	0 (0%)
11	11 (2.5%)	0 (0%)	3 (4.8%)	8 (5.4%)	0 (0%)
12	14 (3.2%)	3 (1.5%)	1 (1.6%)	8 (5.4%)	2 (6.1%)
13	36 (8.2%)	23 (11.7%)	4 (6.3%)	6 (4.1%)	3 (9.1%)
14	66 (15.0%)	26 (13.3%)	14 (22.2%)	21 (14.2%)	5 (15.2%)
15	107 (24.3%)	58 (29.6%)	14 (22.2%)	38 (20.9%)	4 (12.1%)
16	112 (25.5%)	47 (24.0%)	18 (28.6%)	33 (22.3%)	14 (42.4%)
17	91 (20.7%)	39 (19.9%)	9 (14.3%)	38 (25.7%)	5 (15.2%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>440 (100%)</b>	<b>196 (100%)</b>	<b>63 (100%)</b>	<b>148 (100%)</b>	<b>33 (100%)</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>					
Caucasian	87 (19.8%)	25 (12.8%)	12 (19.0%)	39 (26.4%)	11 (33.3%)
Hawaiian	137 (31.1%)	61 (31.1%)	19 (30.2%)	45 (30.4%)	12 (36.4%)
African American	14 (3.2%)	9 (4.6%)	1 (1.6%)	4 (2.7%)	0 (0%)
Chinese	5 (1.1%)	3 (1.5%)	0 (0%)	2 (1.4%)	0 (0%)
Filipino	63 (14.3%)	33 (16.8%)	12 (19.0%)	9 (6.1%)	9 (27.3%)
Japanese	20 (4.5%)	12 (6.1%)	1 (1.6%)	7 (4.7%)	0 (0%)
Korean	3 (0.7%)	2 (1.0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0%)
Latino/ Hispanic	14 (3.2%)	8 (4.1%)	2 (3.2%)	4 (2.7%)	0 (0%)
Native American	2 (0.5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (1.4%)	0 (0%)
Other Asian/ Mixed					
Asian	1 (0.2%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Other Pacific					
Islander/ Mixed					
Pacific Islander	25 (5.7%)	20 (10.2%)	3 (4.8%)	2 (1.4%)	0 (0%)
Samoan	22 (5.0%)	18 (9.2%)	0 (0%)	4 (2.7%)	0 (0%)
Other	8 (1.4%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.6%)	4 (2.7%)	1 (3.0%)
Unknown	41 (9.3%)	4 (2.0%)	12 (19.0%)	25 (16.9%)	0 (0%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>440 (100%)</b>	<b>196 (100%)</b>	<b>63 (100%)</b>	<b>148 (100%)</b>	<b>33 (100%)</b>

**Table 8-1a HYCF rates by type of offense and circuit for the three years (duplicated)**

	2009	2010	2011
<b>Total HYCF</b>	<b>160 (100%)</b>	<b>117 (100%)</b>	<b>86 (100%)</b>
<b>HYCF rates</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>0.8</b>
<b>Type of Offense*</b>			
Drug	4 (2.5%)	7 (6.0%)	1 (1.2%)
Person	17 (10.6%)	14 (12.0%)	12 (14.0%)
Property	51 (31.9%)	26 (22.2%)	22 (25.6%)
Sex	4 (2.5%)	3 (2.6%)	2 (2.2%)
Status	4 (2.5%)	3 (2.6%)	0 (0%)
Person NC	5 (3.1%)	7 (6.0%)	1 (1.2%)
Other	75 (46.9%)	57 (48.7%)	47 (54.8%)

---

\* General population information on youth ages between 10 and 17 were taken from census 2010 to calculate referral rates.

\* The sum of the seven charges may not add up to the total due to missing data.

**Table 8-1b HYCF rates by gender, age, ethnicity and circuit for the three years (unduplicated)**

	2009	2010	2011
<b>Gender</b>			
Male	91 (78%)	65 (72%)	59 (78%)
Female	25 (22%)	25 (28%)	17 (22%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>116 (100%)</b>	<b>90 (100%)</b>	<b>76 (100%)</b>
<b>Age</b>			
10	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
11	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
12	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
13	0 (0%)	1 (1.1%)	0 (0%)
14	7 (6.0%)	3 (3.3%)	3 (3.9%)
15	16 (13.8%)	13 (14.4%)	13 (17.1%)
16	38 (32.8%)	31 (34.4%)	23 (30.3%)
17	55 (47.4%)	42 (46.7%)	37 (48.7%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>116 (100%)</b>	<b>90 (100%)</b>	<b>76 (10%)</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>			
Caucasian	31 (26.7%)	18 (20.0%)	11 (14.5%)
Hawaiian	46 (39.7%)	43 (47.8%)	42 (55.3%)
African American	3 (2.6%)	1 (1.1%)	1 (1.3%)
Chinese	2 (1.7%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.3%)
Filipino	11 (9.5%)	6 (6.7%)	9 (11.8%)
Japanese	4 (3.4%)	6 (6.7%)	2 (2.6%)
Korean	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Latino/ Hispanic	5 (4.3%)	3 (3.3%)	1 (1.3%)
Native American	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.3%)
Other Asian/ Mixed			
Asian	0 (0%)	2 (2.2%)	0 (0%)
Other Pacific			
Islander/ Mixed			
Pacific Islander	7 (6.0%)	7 (7.8%)	2 (2.6%)
Samoan	5 (4.3%)	4 (4.4%)	6 (7.9%)
Other	1 (0.9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Unknown	1 (0.9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>116 (100%)</b>	<b>90 (100%)</b>	<b>76 (100%)</b>